GV
191.67
.F6
S77
2000

PACIFIC SOUTHWEST REGION, USDA FOREST SERVICE

STRATEGY FOR INVENTORY AND HISTORIC EVALUATION OF RECREATION RESIDENCE TRACTS IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS OF CALIFORNIA FROM 1906 TO 1959

FIRST EDITION

U.S. Forest Service
Pacific Southwest Library and Information Center
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592-1110

STRATEGY PREPARED BY

Linda Lux, Judy Rose, Dana Supernowicz, Mike McIntyre,
Pam Conners, Jon Brady, Jan Cutts, and Joan Brandoff-Kerr
Heritage Program, Pacific Southwest Region
USDA Forest Service,
1323 Club Drive, Vallejo, CA 94592
(707) 562-8854 or (707) 562-8855

and Steve McNeil
Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture
Department of Environmental Design
University of California at Davis
Davis, CA 95616

With the assistance of
Susan Lassell
Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc.
2600 V Street
Sacramento, CA 95818

National FS Library
USDA Forest Service

MAR 25 2011

240 W Prospect Rd
Fort Collins CO 80526

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1) Multiple Property Name
Associated Historic Context
Geographic Data
Executive Summary
Acknowledgements
Recreation Residence Strategy Fact Sheet
Summary of Evaluations

2) Statement of Historic Context
Introduction
Chapter 1: The Larger Cultural Contexts
Chapter 2: Role of Recreation Residences in Forest Service Recreation Policy
Chapter 3: Permit History and Administration
Chapter 4: The Homebuilders and Owners
Chapter 5: Recreation Residences and Rustic Vernacular Architecture
Chapter 6: Recreation Residence History in Region 5
References Cited

3) Associated Property Types
Property Type Description – Physical Characteristics
Recreation Residence Tracts
Recreation Residence Lots
Property Type Significance
Criterion A
Criterion C
Property Type Registration Requirements

4) Identification and Evaluation Methods
Identification Method
Evaluation Method
Period of Significance
Criteria Considerations
Scale of Analysis
Analysis of Representative and Unique Characteristics
Analysis Process
Significance Statement for Tracts and Their Contributors
References

5) Appendices

Appendix 1. Current Status of Inventory and Evaluations
Appendix 2. Criteria for Prioritizing Evaluations
Appendix 3. Evaluation Schedule
Appendix 4. Forest Service/Department of Parks and Recreation Forms for Recreation Residence Tracts

MULTIPLE PROPERTY NAME

Recreation Residence Tracts in the National Forests of California from 1906 to 1959

ASSOCIATED HISTORIC CONTEXT

Forest Service Recreation Residence Policy and Development of Rustic, Vernacular, Recreation Residence Tracts, on National Forests in California, 1906 to 1959

GEOGRAPHIC DATA

The geographic area encompasses 17 National Forest in the Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5) located in California.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Pacific Southwest Region of the USDA Forest Service has prepared a strategy for the historic inventory and evaluation of recreation residences on the National Forests in California. The strategy is organized in a multiple property format to conform with National Register of Historic Places evaluation guidelines.

The strategy outlines a historic context for recreation residence significance evaluation. It defines the national cultural context of recreation and conservation philosophies under which recreation residences began; the national and regional Forest Service policy that generated recreation residence tract development; home owner contributions to tract development; the property types that characterize the recreation residence resource; and the specific history of tract development in the Pacific Southwest Region.

The strategy identifies and defines the physical characteristics of recreation residence property types. It describes how National Register of Historic Places criteria A and C apply to the property types. It also identifies the registration requirements for the properties.

The strategy provides guidelines for inventory, including site recording forms and tract summary data for recording recreation residence tracts. It also provides guidelines for evaluation of the period of significance, representative and unique characteristics, integrity, and holistic assessment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Pacific Southwest Region of the USDA Forest Service wishes to acknowledge the contributions of many persons and groups who have helped produce this recreation residence historic inventory and evaluation strategy. Marlene Finley, Recreation Special Uses program manager, and her regional recreation residence task group, chartered and encouraged this study, and helped secure funding for its completion. The strategy could not have been completed without the participation and work of the heritage task group, consisting of Linda Lux, Judy Rose, Mike McIntyre, Dana Supernowicz, Pam Conners, Jon Brady, Joan Brandoff-Kerr, and Jan Cutts. Mike McIntyre deserves special recognition for negotiating the contracting maze for the regional office staff. Steve McNiel provided invaluable insights about the nature and occurrence of the historic building and landscape attributes that characterize recreation residences. Jones and Stokes and Susan Lassell provided key information about application of evaluation techniques and holistic assessments. The staff of the State Historic Preservation Office was particularly helpful with reviewing and helping to define evaluation standards, particularly significance thresholds, and with applying the holistic view. Thank you all.

RECREATION RESIDENCE STRATEGY FACT SHEET

General Information

- Region 5 has 6,314 recreation residence permits, subdivided into 269 tracts, spread over 17 Forests.

- Most recreation residence tracts are located in areas of high recreation use, and many are found in areas with sensitive archaeological and other resource values.

- All of the tracts were established prior to 1960; most recreation residences were built prior to 1960.

- Because of their age:
  - most of the tracts and residences are potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places;
  - most have not undergone environmental analysis pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) nor the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Permit Administration

- Recreation residence permits are issued for terms of 20 years.

- Most permits are scheduled for renewal (issuance) in 2008; however, many are scheduled for 2001 or 2005; some are scattered over other years.

- A 1991 National Recreation Residence Review, based largely on California's tracts, identified that in the permitted lots:
  - over 50% has at least one unauthorized improvement,
  - half has recent unauthorized construction,
  - over 50% has permit compliance problems,
  - over 40% has substandard improvements.

  Yet, many of these improvements may be historic.

- Recreation residence policy directs permit compliance issues to be corrected at time of permit renewal or change of ownership (at time of permit issuance).

- Removal of unauthorized improvements is required for renewal of permits.

Recreation Residence Permit Fees

- In FY98, $4,209,000 in recreation residence fees were collected in Region 5.

- If permits are not renewed (issued), annual fees cannot be charged.

- Nonrenewal of permits would mean a decrease in potential revenues to the national treasury and counties.

Recreation Residence Policy and Forest Plans

- Recreation residence policy calls for determination of consistency with current Forest Plans prior to issuance of new permits:
    - Where continued use is consistent with the Forest plan, the authorized officer shall issue a new permit, in accordance with applicable requirements for environmental documentation.

- To renew permits, in tracts considered consistent with Forest plans, compliance with NEPA (and consequently, Section 106 of the NHPA) is required.

- Existing Forest Plans incorporated recreation residence tracts by reference, without specific analysis.
    - Several Forest Plans are scheduled for revision prior to the 2008 renewal date for most tracts.
    - Others may be amended.

- Section 106 NHPA consultation was not conducted on Forest Plans, nor on their incorporated recreation residence documents.

- Lack of Section 106 consultation prevents completion of environmental analysis required by recreation residence policy to issue permits.

- If environmental analysis is not complete, permits cannot be renewed.

NHPA

- Proposed actions that may affect historic values (e.g., replacement of septic systems, changing windows, adding rooms) are undertakings under NHPA, and therefore require consultation pursuant to Section 106.

- Issuance of permits is an undertaking under NHPA, and therefore requires consultation pursuant to Section 106.
    - Permit authorizations are screened exemptions under the Regional and Sierra PAs.
    - Permit authorizations that do not affect historic values (no unauthorized improvements removed, no modifications of improvements or landscapes, etc.) can be exempted based on effects evaluations of Forest Heritage Program Managers.
    - Permit authorizations that can affect historic values require further Section 106 consultation.

- Of the 269 tracts, 90 have been inventoried for historic buildings, and 124 have been inventoried for prehistoric sites (74 are common, with both historic and prehistoric inventories). Of the lots, 2,841 have been inventoried for historic buildings, and 3,963 have been inventoried for prehistoric sites (2,451 are common, with both historic and prehistoric inventories).

- A total of 179 tracts, containing 3,473 lots, remains to be inventoried for historic buildings; and, a total of 145 tracts, containing 2,351 lots, remains to be inventoried for prehistoric sites. Thus, 66% of the region's tracts remains to be inventoried for historic buildings, and 54% for prehistoric sites.

- Currently, only 7 of the inventoried tracts in the region have had the Section 106 consultation process completed. Thus, 262 tracts still need consultation completed.

- Because of the nature of recreation residence tracts (each tract was planned and surveyed as a unit), the State Historic Preservation Officer requests that entire tracts be submitted for evaluation.

Strategy Schedule

- A preliminary draft of the strategy was produced, in house, in FY99.

- A contract was let in FY99 to test the preliminary strategy and fine-tune the evaluation standards.

- A final of the strategy was prepared in FY00 and agreed on by the SHPO.

- A significant portion of recreation residence tracts will be evaluated under FY00 contract, based on the prioritized list of tract evaluations (Appendix 3). Future tract evaluations will be accomplished based on funding levels and the prioritized list.

- Consultation with heritage and recreation staffs, SHPO and the Council, peer reviewers, and interested parties will continue throughout.

Permit Administration Benefits

- Opportunities resulting from gathering heritage information are abilities to manage National Forest lands and to implement recreation residence policies.

- Section 106 consultation ensures that:
    - Proposed actions which may affect historic values are evaluated;
    - NEPA environmental analyses are completed.

- With NEPA environmental decisions, permits can be authorized and decisions can be made on proposed actions.

- With permit authorizations:
  - existing trespass can be resolved;
  - corrections to permit compliance violations can be implemented;
  - use of existing structures can be authorized;
  - improvements can be authorized;
  - permit fees can be collected; and
  - revenue payments to counties and schools will continue.

- With historic evaluations, permit administrators are able to deal with permittee requests for renewals and modifications in a timely manner.

- Evaluations will identify tracts with historic values that must be considered in decision-making, and tracts without historic values that need no such consideration.

- For eligible tracts with historic values, management guidelines will define treatments that can be exempted from Section 106 case-by-case consultation and treatments that must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Region-wide Heritage Management Benefits

- Recreation residences will be evaluated on a schedule over the next few years until all tracts are evaluated.

- The strategy is:
  - establishing consistent regional standards for inventory and historic evaluation;
  - evaluating the region's recreation residences by those standards;
  - meeting State Historic Preservation Officer and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation preference to review eligibility and effects evaluations of tracts rather than individual residences;
  - establishing management guidelines that take historic values into consideration;
  - meeting management needs for completed evaluations and treatment guidelines to facilitate permit administration and decision-making.

- Inventory standards include data collection guides to ensure collection of information necessary to evaluation of tracts.

- Evaluation standards include a historic context, and a ratings process for historic landscape and rustic vernacular architectural values, to be used in assessing eligibility.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

In the late 1980s, the region recognized the need to evaluate recreation residences on forest lands for their eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places and supported the development of thematic study of the resource. Because the Eldorado National Forest managed the largest number of summer homes in the region, and was besieged with requests for additions, alterations, and improvements these homes, the forest conducted some of the earliest studies.

Between 1992 and 1993 initial work was done in documenting the residences on the Eldorado, and a regional contextual history developed. In 1993 Steve McNiel, Assistant Professor of Landscape Architecture at the University of California, Davis, assisted with development of a systematic approach to evaluation. His involvement was particularly helpful because of his background in evaluating historic landscapes and quantitative analysis.

Between 1993 and 1994 the first group of evaluations on the Eldorado were produced. Several early generalizations were made. The residences on the Eldorado, built between 1915 and 1950, shared common designs, settings, and other characteristics. Generally, differences in the history of each tract were subtle and did not make or break potential eligibility under Criterion A. Landscapes were included in their analyses, but for the most part, played a neutral role in the evaluations given their general lack of change. Subsequent studies focused on the individual residences themselves, and allowed for quantifying the threshold at which a residence lost historic integrity. A numeric system, using a sliding scale from 1 - 6 was developed.

Between 1996 and 1998, several tracts received concurrence from the SHPO. The first tracts that were tested were Strawberry and Atwood, both along the Highway 50 corridor. The work was submitted to SHPO resulting in their concurrence on the eligibility of Strawberry and ineligibility of Atwood. The process and level of documentation was found to be acceptable. The context submitted for these two tracts included a generic context for the region, the Eldorado, and the specific tracts. Hence, the next tracts to be tackled would focus on the tract specific context.

Professor McNiel finished an abbreviated analysis of the remainder of the tracts on the Eldorado. This analysis was not as lengthy as the earlier tracts, but sufficient to describe each tract and residence, and to rate them. These are pending the Forest's providing the rest of the data.

In the meantime, in 1997-98 other evaluations, including Silver Lake on the Lassen, all tracts on the Cleveland, and the Echo Summit Tract on the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, were processed. SHPO concurred with the finding on the Echo Summit Tract and with the Cleveland tracts. Seven examples of eligible and ineligible tracts have gone through the consultation process. Pinecrest on the Stanislaus was determined eligible, and an in-holding tract in Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks, Mineral King, went to the Keeper for listing in1999.

The following strategy draws heavily on the evaluation work accomplished on the Eldorado and other forests, most of which utilized the approach developed by Professor McNiel and Dana Supernowicz. It has been refined and clarified, but was based on several years of experience and testing.

STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXT

FOREST SERVICE RECREATION RESIDENCE POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT OF RUSTIC, VERNACULAR, RECREATION RESIDENCE TRACTS ON NATIONAL FORESTS IN CALIFORNIA, 1906 TO 1959

INTRODUCTION

Recreation residences, sometimes called summer homes, or vacation homes, or second homes, are privately owned structures, permitted on National Forest System lands. They have existed, under Forest Service policies, since the turn of the 20th century--since the very beginnings of the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and the National Forest System.

Over the years, more than 19,000 recreation residences have been constructed, on 116 National Forests, in 27 states, and in the territory of Puerto Rico. Most are located in the Far West, with the largest number of them in California (Berg 1975:1).

Recreation residences are a public lands phenomenon essentially peculiar to the Forest Service. Few other federal agencies have established recreation residence programs. Those that have, manage them on much smaller scales. Second homes are also found on some state lands, and, of course, on many areas of private land; but those are not governed by federal regulations, and are not considered here.

Among other federal agencies, the Army Corps of Engineers permits about 1400 vacation cottages, primarily in the Midwest, along reservoir projects in the Missouri and Mississippi drainages. At one time, the Bureau of Land Management leased recreation residence tracts, primarily in California's southern desert country; but, it eventually sold those tracts to the leasees. The National Park Service has several recreation residences, some resulting from a short lived program at Grand Coulee and Lake Mead National Recreation Areas, and others resulting from residences existing prior to park establishment (Berg 1975:124-128).

In California, the National Park Service manages some recreation residences, at Lassen National Park and at Mineral King, in Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks. At Lassen, the residences existed prior to park authorization (Berg 1975:128). At Sequoia, the residences resulted from incorporation of former Forest Service permits, when Mineral King was transferred from Forest Service to National Park Service control (Carr and McNiel 1999:1-2).

The Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5; California and the Pacific Islands) of the USDA Forest Service has more recreation residences than any other Forest Service region in the country. Recreation residence tracts are found in mountainous areas on all but one of the region's National Forests, with all of them in California. Currently, Region 5 has 269 tracts with a total of 6,314 individual permits; this represents nearly 50% of the recreation residences in the National Forests nation-wide. At its peak in 1968, the region had more than 9,000 recreation

residence permits; it has permitted between 60% and 45% of the total number of recreation residences throughout the history of the Forest Service. Today, tract sizes in the Pacific Southwest Region range from 1 to 385 permits, though most tracts average fewer than 100 permitted lots.

The earliest recreation residences documented in the Pacific Southwest Region date to 1906. Most of the early, scattered, residences were later incorporated into surveyed tracts. Recreation residence tracts in the region were first surveyed in 1915, following implementation of the Occupancy Permits Act. Over the succeeding years, tracts were added and changed, until 1959, when the last tract was developed. Most recreation residence tracts are now over 50 years old. Most have, on a whole, undergone constant change; but, most also maintain a historic, rustic character, as a result of the Forest Service guidelines permitting their use.

The following overview of the recreation residence phenomenon provides a context for understanding and evaluating this class of properties for its historical significance. Chapter 1 outlines the larger cultural contexts that inspired development of recreation residences in the early decades of the 20th century. Chapter 2 discusses Forest Service recreation program development, and the roles of recreation residences and recreation in Forest Service policies. It attempts to explain some of the reasons for the program's existence. Chapter 3 outlines the administrative history of Forest Service Special Use Permits, and management of the recreation residence program including the development of the guidelines for rustic character. Chapter 4 provides basic information about the homeowners and their contributions to the character and history of recreation residences. Chapter 5 discusses the history of vernacular architecture in relation to recreation residences in California, and the architectural trends and forms that inspired them. Chapter 6 outlines recreation residence history and tract development in the Pacific Southwest Region, in California.

CHAPTER 1

THE LARGER CULTURAL CONTEXTS

Recreation residence tracts and buildings are the result of agency management and the inclinations of the builders themselves. But both participants drew on larger cultural trends for their inspiration: turn-of-the-20th century, romantic notions of nature, and the populist thinking of the conservation movement. These influences are summarized in this chapter; they lead to a better understanding of what makes recreation residences important, and what makes them unique.

The Back-to-Nature Movement

The development of recreation residences was, in part, a response to national movements in both outdoor recreation and conservation (Berg 1975:68). Until the mid-19th century, a romantic view of nature, based on European traditions, was a major part of the American psyche. To the romantic, humans held a prominent place in the natural landscape. The transcendentalist movement then expanded this romantic outlook, and writers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau popularized the notion that nature should be preserved both for its own sake and for people needing relief from an increasingly urban and industrial society (Cox 1985:157; Davis 1983:105). These trends brought about an increased appreciation of natural settings and of conservation of natural resources; and California became a primary focus of this interest (Berg 1975:69).

Prior to 1870, most Americans learned about California's mountains and forested areas from romantic stories, and through painters like Albert Bierstadt and photographers like Carlton Watkins. Many of the first accounts of California's Sierra, San Gabriel, and San Bernardino mountains were written by explorers and mountaineers such as Joseph Le Conte, J. D. Whitney, William Brewer, John Muir, and Clarence King. In 1872, King published *Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada* (King 1872). The book opened the doors to many more exploratory surveys of the high Sierra, and helped promote the beauty and mystique of the Sierra. John Muir, like King, was captivated by the massiveness of the Sierra Nevada. He became a self-taught poet and naturalist who brought California to the attention of the world.

In the late 1800s, publications began to emphasize California's tourist attractions. In 1883, the H. S. Crocker Company of San Francisco published *Beauties of California: Including Big Trees, Yosemite Valley, Geysers, Lake Tahoe, and Donner Lake, etc.* (Griswold 1883). In 1889, N. C. Carnall, also of San Francisco, published the *California Guide for Tourists and Settlers* (Carnall 1889). One year later the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, published *California: It's Attractions for the Invalid, Tourist, Capitalist and Homeseeker* (Southern Pacific Company 1890). Each of these books extolled California's natural wonders and unparalleled beauty, and played an important part in attracting people to the state's rural areas.

By the turn-of-the-20th, along with books promoting settlement and tourism in California, came books and articles devoted to recreation. One of the first, published in 1889 by Mrs. J. B. Rideout, was entitled *Camping Out in California* (Rideout 1889). Rideout romanticized camping and called it a "religious experience". In 1908, Edward Breck wrote *The Way of the Woods: A Manual for Sportsmen in Northeastern United States and Canada* (Breck 1908). Breck promoted his book as a, "...practical field manual to form part of the kit of every camper, fishermen, and hunter". That same year, G. P. Putnam's Sons published Charles Holder's book entitled *Recreations of a Sportsman on the Pacific Coast* (Holder 1910). In 1912, J. A. Graves wrote *Out of Doors, California and Oregon*, with one chapter devoted to, "an auto trip through the Sierra" (Graves 1912). And two years later Ruth Kedzie Wood published *The Tourist's California*, which detailed tourist opportunities across the state (Wood 1914). During the early 1900s, *Sunset Magazine* of Menlo Park became a leader in recreation publishing with its articles about outdoor activities and camping.

The Back-to-Nature Movement became extremely popular in southern California. During the 1890s, hiking clubs were formed to take advantage of the rugged trails that dotted the San Gabriel Mountains and Mount Wilson east of Los Angeles; and Pasadena became the center of this outdoor recreation movement (Headley 1991:24-27). This pervasive interest in the natural environment in turn influenced the art and architecture of the area. Artists expressed their philosophy of nature in sculpture and paintings. In architecture, natural, organic building materials were preferred over materials such as stucco and concrete. These ideals of simplicity and the creative use of natural materials were consequently expressed in architecture of the foothills communities, including recreation residence tracts, such as Big Santa Anita Canyon.

Although recreational activities, like tourism, hunting, and fishing, remained, even until after World War I, largely the purview of the elite, and rural resorts and private summer cottages were beyond reach of many Americans, this elitism began to change. In 1904, Henrietta S. Breck wrote, in the popular magazine *Out West*:

> Half a score of years ago the camping habit was confined almost entirely to the bohemian element and the devotees of science, but of late it has infected all classes of society and each summer adds new thousands to the thousands of all sorts and conditions who cast aside the trammels of the year's routine, the fret and worry, the harassing cares, the brain-weary ambitions and go into camp for as long a time as can possibly be cajoled from that hard-hearted mistress, duty (Breck 1904:401).

Camping and outdoor activities were increasingly popular; yet, interestingly enough, most people were disinclined to give up completely the comforts of urban life. A sturdy cabin in the woods with a roaring fire was still the limit of most people's idea of a wilderness experience (Cox 1985:158). Oliver Kemp wrote a book for just such an adventurer, *Wilderness Homes: A Book of the Log Cabin*, which showed the amateur how to construct a modest but comfortable home away from home (Kemp 1908). Thomas Cox in a discussion of the Back-to-Nature Movement stated that:

> A new kind of crusade for nature emerged in the first decade of the twentieth century. It was an attempt to have the best of both worlds: living in the city but feeding spiritual needs through occasional returns to outdoor life by vacations and outings or, vicariously, through literature (Cox 1985:167).

According to Historian Don Headley, the "...conservationists of Southern California, for all their mountain activities and their woodcraft, never lost their urban orientation" (Headley 1991:116).

This desire by the average person to experience nature was facilitated by material and technological advances. People were earning more and working fewer hours; they had more time and could afford to take vacations. The "age of the automobile" saw the development of more and better road systems, and forested areas became accessible for recreation. In 1915 the Forest Service published *The Handbook for Campers in the National Forests in California,* which stated that: "Roads and trails built by the Government are open to the public and make many regions available for camping that were formerly inaccessible." (Graves 1915a:3). Hotels and resorts sprang up throughout rural California. This was when the pressure to expand the summer home program increased.

The Conservation Movement

While much of the popular literature of the late 19th and early 20th centuries spoke of the opportunities and wealth of California's natural resources, a crosscurrent literature emerged that challenged the needless exploitation of the nation's natural resources. Until then, the West had been thought to have an abundance of resources free for the taking. With the close of the frontier in the 1890s, Americans took notice of the rapid degradation of natural resources. Overgrazing and uncontrolled fires had caused significant watershed problems, which led to the creation of the forest reserves. Ranching, farming, and urbanization were beginning to make significant changes to California's landscape, and to take a toll on the state that once boasted of its unlimited natural resources.

A popular movement in the United States calling for the protection of the nation's natural beauty grew out of the romantic-transcendentalist appreciation for nature (Cox 1985:156). By the early 1900s, this conservation movement formed the ideology of Progressive Reform and led, among other things, to the creation of public lands and the Forest Service. Thus, the agency was born of an era where people were rejecting the excesses of previous generations, and thoughtful, scientific management of natural resources was gaining credence. In this same vein, the Forest Service saw itself as an agency focused on local, rural concerns, working for "the community and the home builder" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1905:3). Its philosophy of "for the good of the whole people" and the simple, outdoor lifestyles of foresters influenced the evolution of the agency's management style. These views and philosophy, combined

with the fact that recreation was a secondary, incidental use of forests, meant that the Forest Service emphasized simple, low-keyed, rustic, recreation experiences.

This can be contrasted with the National Park Service, which operated on a more grandiose scale, promoting its parks for the affluent tourist, and tending toward formal, highly-developed, albeit rustic, facilities. Instead, the Forest Service prided itself on its modest approach, and often castigated the Park Service for "...accommodating comfort-seeking travelers at the expense of the park lands" (Rothman 1997:118). Yet, at the same time, the agency constantly felt a need to defend itself against aggressive, competitive Park management, especially with regard to recreation (Rothman 1997; Tweed 1980:5).

The urban visitor in the rural forested environment frequently supported development of recreation residence tracts, tourist-oriented resorts, and hiking trails. Certainly, some turn-of-the-20th century conservationists viewed summer home development as a threat to the natural environment, but most encouraged development. In Southern California, many individuals who espoused the Conservation Movement also acquired terminable permits for cabins on national forests. Frequently, permittees gained a conservation ethic only after acquiring permits and occupying cabins for a number of years. This somewhat contradictory set of values led to an proprietary sense among some permittees that their stewardship of the forest environment was more valid than that of other forest users (Berg 1975:79).

So, at the beginning of the 20th century, people had an idealized notion of nature, yet still clung to traditional European, pastoral notions of wilderness. They were acutely aware of the changing rural environment and wished to preserve it (Cox 1985). They were increasingly interested in, and had the time and resources for, travel away from home. Forest lands offered a wealth of opportunities for outdoor recreation, yet not the elaborate tourist destinations of the Parks. This was the cultural framework that surrounded and inspired the building of recreation residences over the following decades. It was the source of these rural landscapes' distinctive character and architecture.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROLE OF RECREATION RESIDENCES IN FOREST SERVICE RECREATION POLICY

Recreation residence tracts have played a complex and intriguing role in the evolution of land use policy in the Forest Service, a role which can be best be understood within its larger context of recreation as a forest use. The Forest Service supported and even promoted the establishment of recreation residences, from the beginning of its authority to permit such uses until at least the 1950s. On the surface, there were some straightforward, practical reasons for this, but there were also more convoluted, complex reasons for the promulgation of recreation residence permits by the agency.

At the same time, throughout Forest Service history, questions have been raised about the appropriateness of recreation residence permits, their administration, and their relationship to other forest uses. Two key factors seem to have set the stage for controversy. First, recreation itself was not one of the original reasons for the creation of forest reserves (and later National Forests); and thus, recreation's status as a publicly funded, legitimate use was questioned. Instead, permitted recreation, such as with recreation residences, was seen as a means to satisfy growing recreation needs with minimal obligation on the part of the agency. Second, summer homes were privately owned, but built on public land. This single, exclusive use of public lands by private individuals created a complex, private-public relationship that undoubtedly was part of the larger conflict between the western states and the federal government over the creation of forest reserves from the public domain.

One thing that is clear is that during the early decades, the Forest Service actively promoted summer home occupancy. The District Forester provided annual reports on progress and availability of tracts and lots. The National Forests published brochures with tract and lot information. Even private publications extolled the virtues of the Forest Service recreation residence program (Berg 1975:93-95, 102). As an example, a University of California instructor wrote in a series of volumes devoted to California:

> The newest development in the national forests is that of summer homes. Oftentimes developments include the surveying of lots and the building of roads and trails. Within ten years the few permits originally granted near Los Angeles and at Lake Tahoe increased to nearly four thousand. Big Bear Lake in the San Bernardino National Forest in 1927 had some 1,800 summer permittees and fifty resorts. The restrictions are few. Many a business man has gained healthful and keen enjoyment in clearing a small area and erecting thereon a cabin in accordance with his purse and ability. There are no building restrictions except that improvements must be permanent, neat, attractive, and in keeping with the natural surroundings. Lots are from one quarter to one acre in size, and the rental varies from $10.00 to $25.00 per year. The lease is negotiable with the consent of

> the Forest Service. Thousands of urbanites spend every week-end during the summer at their mountain cabins, the sites of which are rented to them by the Federal government (Bryant 1929:347-348).

Even in 1956, an article in American Forests was still promoting the idea of recreation residences, but its wording was considerably more cautious:

> In allowing private citizens to build summer homes on national forest lands, the government is granting an exclusive private use of public property. It is, therefore, only natural and proper that such use must not be allowed to interfere with public or semi-public use of the forest as a whole. For that reason, summer homes may be permitted only in areas which, because of topography or location are unsuitable for public use or on areas which, as far as can be foreseen, will not be needed for present or future use and where the presence of summer homes will not interfere with public needs on other areas (Bellomy 1956:21)
>
> ....To preserve the forest's natural appearance, no homes are allowed within sight of highways or lakes, along fishing streams, near public use areas or scenic attractions (*Ibid.*:51).

What were the reasons, then, for promoting summer homes on national forests during the early years of the Forest Service?

Practical Reasons – The First 30 Years

Protection of Forest Resources - The reasons for active promotion of the recreation residence program are not stated, but several interrelated factors seem to have been at play. First, there was a need to ensure that forest resources and public health were not endangered by sanitation problems, or by the threat of fire associated with the recreating public. In its 1913 annual report of the Forester, the Forest Service first recognized that the demand for recreation was growing rapidly (Graves 1913:42; Tweed 1980:2-3), but was not in a position to fully incorporate this use into its mission. Congress itself did not appropriate funds for recreation development, other than for dealing with sanitation and fire issues, until 1923 (Greeley 1923:37). Instead, expanding recreation needs were met through the development of permitted, privately owned facilities (Tweed 1980:3).

Also, recreation residence permittees were seen as people with a stake in the proper management of the National Forests. In 1917, Frank A. Waugh, professor of Landscape Architecture at Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, reported, after talking with many forest officers, that:

> ...contrary to common expectation...the presence of campers and summer home permittees in considerable numbers, instead of increasing the fire risk has actually assisted positively in fire protection (Waugh 1917:134).

The Forest Service saw homeowners as a ready militia of firefighters during the dry season.

> The use of national forests as places of residence should be especially encouraged if not in conflict with other more important uses or with good administration. A residence occupied under the restrictions imposed by a permit not only reduces the fire risk as compared to transient camping, but makes of the permittee a volunteer fire fighter whose interest in forest problems is increased by reason of close contact with them and financial investment in a forest (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest 1926:25-L).

Recreation Residences as a Source of Income - There were economic reasons for promoting recreation residences, which helped explain early Forest Service dependence on permits and fees. These were grounded in an agency philosophy of revenue generation promoted by Gifford Pinchot, the first Forester, and facilitated by early legislation.

The Transfer Act of 1905 (which moved the Forest Service from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture) contained a provision that allocated monies from the sale of forest products or the use of reserve lands to a special, five-year fund under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture, "...for the protection, administration, improvement, and extension of the reserves..." (Pinchot 1905:205). Showing his business oriented management style in the 1905 annual report, Pinchot (*Ibid.*:202) stated:

> The publication of revised regulations and prompt business methods have brought about a general understanding that the forest reserves are for the use of the people, with a large consequent increase in the business of the reserves and the revenue from them.

After the transfer to the Department of Agriculture, the Forest Service appealed to the Attorney General for the right to charge for forest resources—a position contrary to that maintained while a division of the Department of Interior. The Attorney General upheld this right, and revenues of $522,306.47 for nontimber receipts were first listed in the Report of the Forester, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906 (Pinchot 1907:8). The vast majority of these earnings was from grazing permits, with fees implemented for grazing on the reserves after January 1, 1906 (*Ibid.*:16).

Forest Service generation of revenues in turn generated: the ire of many persons and groups, such as cattlemen and developers, who had previously used reserve resources for free; requests from states and local governments to share in the revenues as compensation for loss of taxes; and the attention of legislators who wished to channel the revenues back into the general treasury (Williams 1998:3-4). Thus, the special reserve fund was short lived. In the appropriations act of March 4, 1907, the fund was abolished, and Forest Service revenues reverted back to the Treasury (Pinchot 1907:6; Williams 1998:4). However, Forest Service generation of revenues continued, and the revenues were cited in all subsequent annual reports of the Forester.

The earliest Report of the Forester to cite revenues from special uses, most of which came from water and power use, was in 1907, when they totaled $30,425.23, compared to a much larger income from grazing, at $962,829.40 (Pinchot 1908:12). In 1917, the Report of the Forester stated that an increase of 28 percent in revenues from all types of special use permits nationwide came largely as a result of the newly passed Occupancy Permits Act which regulated recreation residences and other special uses on the national forests (see Chapter 3), and the resultant increase in summer home permitting. In this report, special uses revenues totaled $107,530.85 (Potter 1917:22), or a little less than one-third of the revenues received from grazing (*Ibid.*:1).

Nevertheless, there are somewhat contradictory statements with regard to special use permit fees. Early instructions regarding Term Occupancy Permits state that: "The primary object of term permits is not to secure a revenue but to promote the use of National Forest lands for recreation purposes..." (Graves 1915:3); and: "It is the recreation use of the forest lands that this act is designed to stimulate, and it is this purpose rather than the raising of revenue that fixes the rental charges..." (DuBois 1916:47). However, even among these early statements, revenues were a consideration (Graves 1915b:3):

> ...since permittees obtain special benefits, it is only fair that they should reimburse the Government to some extent for the expenditures it incurs in administering the land. As to summer homes, a fair annual charge should be made, taking into consideration the accessibility of the tract, special advantages which it may offer, and the amount of land covered by the permit.

Or, consider this revenue conscious statement (Waugh 1917:126) :

> At the present time the actual returns from the National Forests for special uses--chiefly recreational--are over $100,000 a year. Yet recreation use, like watershed protection, does not express itself in terms of forest income. In other words, the cash return from special uses bears no necessary relation to the value of the recreation, considered in terms of human health, personal welfare or social efficiency.

Also, consider this pointed reference to the 1920 annual report by Forester William B. Greeley (Greeley 1920:19), who spoke of the recreation residence program on the Angeles National Forest (American Forestry 1921:413):

> The summer home business promises to become an important source of revenue...revenue from this one item amounted to approximately $22,000. It is believed that within a few years the revenues obtained from the various recreational settlements within the Angeles Forest will pay the entire cost of protection and administration.

Harold Steen, in his history of the Forest Service, cited memoranda from the middle 1920s that supported the assumption that summer homes remained in official favor because they provided a steady source of revenue (Steen 1976:159-160, footnote 37). Speaking to recreation in general, but pointing out that summer homes were an important part of recreation, the Forest Supervisor of the Pike National Forest in Colorado stated: "Some Forests, feeling the urge to increase revenues, have been particularly active in recreational lines as a means directly or indirectly to that end" (Keithley 1929:246).

More altruistic reasons of the "greatest good for the greatest number in the long run" were quoted in a Forest Service document:

> A picturesque canyon might have a high aesthetic value in providing summer homes for fifty families, the rental of which for this purpose would bring a gross return to the public purse of a thousand dollars a year, while the hundred head of sheep the canyon might support would produce a revenue of approximately seven dollars for three months use. From the human angle in this case there was the partial interests of one sheepman against that of fifty users of a different type... (Brown and Show 1944:251-252).

At the very least, the Forest Service promoted the formation of recreation residence permittee cooperative associations to help meet the costs of administrative needs.

> Holders of summer-home permits often formed cooperative associations to provide common facilities and services, including community docks, boathouses, water systems, telephone and power services, and buildings for community meetings...watchman services, delivery of supplies, and fire protection. Associations also afford a medium through which forest users can advise the Forest Service of their needs and by round-table discussion arrive at an amicable solution of common problems (Tweed 1980:3).

Recreation in the Early Forest Service

Understanding the role of recreation in early Forest Service history also sheds some light on agency support of the permit process in its early decades. In 1891, the Forest Reserves Act authorized the President to set aside forest reserves from the public domain to regulate water and to protect the reserves from unauthorized timber use (16 U.S.C. 471). The Organic Administration Act of 1897 went on to further specify that forest reserves were to be established: "...for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States..."(16 U.S.C. 475).

The act did not specifically list recreation as one of the resources that would justify creation of forest reserves, and Gifford Pinchot, the Forest Service's first chief, did not see recreation as a primary use for forest lands (Tweed 1980:2). Furthermore, Congress, through the budget process, largely restricted the agency's mission to conservation of

timber and water resources, limiting recreation expenditures to public safety and protection of the primary resources.

In 1923, the Forester cited the first appropriation for recreation funding, at $25,000, a sum which, he stated, was wholly inadequate, by about one-fifth of that needed to administer recreation uses on the forests (Greeley 1923:37). Despite regular pleas for additional funding to meet recreation needs, the appropriation had only reached $40,000 in 1926, less than one-sixth of the estimated basic need (Greeley 1926:33-34).

Nevertheless, people had long used forests for recreation; and during the first few decades of the agency, this use increased dramatically, particularly near the urban centers of southern California, northern Oregon, and central Colorado (Tweed 1980:1). Edward A. Sherman, Associate Forester for Lands, in a manuscript sent to Ovid M. Butler, Secretary of the American Forestry Association in 1925, said:

> Before the National Forests were thought of the people of the surrounding country used these areas...for recreation; after the establishment of the Forests they simply continued this use and expanded it....The Forest Service did not create the idea of recreational use...rather the public came in of its own accord, each year in increasing numbers, and the Forest Service recognizing that recreation was a resource, like timber and water, used its best efforts to see that it was so handled as to make the greatest returns to the national welfare... (Sherman 1925:1).

The Occupancy Permits Act, which is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3, allowed for the permitting of recreation residences on public lands. As is often the case with a new law, it addressed an ongoing activity. The Act in further legitimized recreation homes that already existed on forest lands. At first, the Forest Service supported the act, in order to contain recreation, and control it through the permit process. By the time of Sherman's statement above, it was actively promoting recreation as a forest use.

Certainly there were those within the agency who recognized that recreation was important to the public, but interesting discussions in the early literature reflected a tug-of-war between the multiple uses. Most of those discussions revolved around the idea of "highest use", a guiding principle in agency history. Soon after establishment of the Forest Service in 1905, Gifford Pinchot laid out the tenet that when a choice needed to be made between conflicting uses on national forests, the conflict would, "...always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1993:12). This concept of highest use was not easily applied in an agency whose timber and watershed agenda had been laid out for it in law, yet which had to contend with other, sometimes conflicting, uses, such as recreation.

Then, within various types of recreation uses, recreation residences were seen as a potential conflict. Sherman, addressing the Society of American Foresters, pointed out that from the beginning, application of the highest use concept, especially with respect to recreation, was not static:

> The rallying cry of "use," as later modified by the slogan that each tract of land within the National Forests should be put to its highest use, is being further modified, until we are beginning to realize that in some instances the highest use may include what many practical men would consider non-use (Sherman 1916:293).

He meant here that recreation was considered by some to be a "nonuse".

A Forest Service document written in the 1920s recognized the importance of recreation to the public and grappled further with this idea of highest use:

> These [recreation] utilities, which singly or in combination afford the bases for outdoor recreation, contributing to the entertainment and instruction of the public or to public health, constitute recreation resources of great extent, economic value and social importance.... Their preservation, development and wise use for the promotion of public welfare is an important and essential feature of forest management ranking with the production of timber and forage and the conservation of water resources.... Major timber, grazing, or water values should not be sacrificed to minor recreation values. On the other hand, major recreation values should never be sacrificed to minor timber, grazing, or water values. Where recreation and other forms of use conflict, the first step should be to determine whether careful planning will not secure maximum utilization of one resource with minimum injury to the other.... If, however, a conflict between two forms of use cannot be reconciled then the use of greatest importance should take precedence over the others and where recreational utilities are clearly of minor importance they may be disregarded or suppressed (Author unknown 1920s:1).

Consultant Frank A. Waugh was well ahead of his time when he suggested that in some cases recreation stood on par with other major uses of forests: "On the principal areas of the National Forests recreation is an incidental use; on some it is a paramount use; on a few it becomes the exclusive use" (Waugh 1917:132). He also advocated the hiring of professional landscape architects to develop recreation plans rather than giving this job to untrained foresters (*Ibid.* 1917:156). Yet, the agency did not even request funds for recreation until 1920 (Greeley 1920:20). Two years later, it had been appropriated $25,000 (1/5 the amount needed) and that was only for fire prevention and sanitary precautions related to recreation rather than development of recreation facilities (Bachman 1967:3; Tweed 1980:11; Greeley 1923:37).

At that time, Sherman did, in fact, hire the Forest Service's first trained landscape architect, Arthur H. Carhart. Carhart introduced ideas regarding recreation and scenic values, and attempted to define an appropriate role for recreation residences.

> There are a number of places with scenic values of such great worth that they are rightfully property of all people. They should be preserved for all time for the people of the nation and the world (Carhart 1920a:1).

He called for careful planning and placement of summer homes away from primary recreation spots, concerned that a small group might destroy scenic beauty for all people (Carhart 1920a:1-3; Carhart 1920b:1). His innovative ideas intrigued his superiors, but were rejected, probably because of their presentation more than their lack of soundness. Carhart was seen as impractical and idealistic, and this was blamed on his lack of training as a forester (Tweed 1980:12). But clearly, this prejudice was based in a more fundamental resistance on the part of some in the Forest Service to consider recreation a legitimate use of forest lands. Carhart eventually resigned, "...despairing over the improbability of seeing his proposals adopted" (Steen 1976:154).

This discomfort with recreation as a forest use continued for many years. One Forest Supervisor wrote:

> How soon we forget and lose sight of the original motives that prompt some of our laws. Many men in the organization did for a while oppose outwardly as much as they dared this new use [recreation] of the forests. It interfered with the grazer, the timber operator, and the forester (Keithley 1929:247).

And as it grew, recreation came to be seen more and more as a threat to other uses. As an example, in 1936, then Forester Ferdinand A. Silcox (1933-1939) felt a need to assure wool growers and cattlemen that the Forest Service would not replace grazing use with recreation (Author unknown N.D.:91).

The debate over forest recreation and highest use was important because it demonstrated that the status of recreation on National Forests was not always certain; it faced an uphill struggle at best. An internal dichotomy had been set up between the timber and watershed mission of the agency and the reality of exploding recreation use, largely propelled by increased use of automobiles and an expanding road system on forest lands. For those that realized the importance of recreation, there was little or no support, financially or legally. The only tool that allowed the Forest Service to address the growing demand for public recreation was the permit process. And so, permitting campsites and summer homes became an important part of the early forest officer's job, and the Forest Service actively promoted recreation residence permits.

Recreation Residences and Public Recreation

If recreation's relationship to timber and water was debated, so were recreation residences within the larger mix of recreation uses. There certainly were inconsistencies between Forest Service policy and stated priorities, and what actually occurred on the ground.

Early Forest Service direction had already more than hinted at concerns over conflicting recreation uses. The 1915 Use Book had addressed possible interference with others seeking recreation in the same location, stating that rights of way should be reserved for the free ingress and egress of forest users (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

1915:137; Tweed 1980:1). And agency instructions regarding Term Occupancy Permits hoped to counter the possibility of recreation residences monopolizing choice sites: "Great care should be taken to prevent a few persons gaining control of the best sites where it would be possible to suitably accommodate many others" (Graves 1915b:1).

On the other hand, in his design guidelines, Frank Waugh stated that: "...the territory usually desired for permanent camps is tree covered, and lies in canyons, along mountain streams, or beside mountain lakes" (Waugh 1918a:7-21). His concern for public access of lakes and streams seemed secondary: "...occasional breaks in the lot series are usually desirable as providing public rights of way...", and, "A public service road or trail is usually necessary...This road should, whenever possible, run at the rear of the lots" (Waugh 1918a:12). Waugh did not question the placement of lots on the choicest recreation spots.

The 1920s document prioritized recreational uses on National Forests. At that time, almost all built recreation sites were permitted, e.g., recreation residences or summer camps; there were no major Forest Service developed recreation facilities, e.g., campgrounds or picnic sites. In a list of nine "recreation privileges", summer homes were listed last, below public campgrounds, health camps, hotels, public utilities, etc. The principle of highest use was applied and those recreation uses that benefited the larger public were given priority:

> Land of little or no value for general public use may be wholly satisfactory and desirable for summer residential purposes and toward such tracts the growth of summer home development should be directed (Author unknown 1920s:2).

An early Recreation Plan and Policy Statement in an Atlas from the San Bernardino National Forest curtailed tract development in certain areas, because of concerns about higher use. It talked about population pressures, and implied that public recreation needs had grown (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest 1928:4).

Later, a November 3, 1937, Region 5 study of recreation, by Frank M. Sweeley, Associate Forester, cited summer homes as the 11th recreation priority; the priority list was led by natural and historic features as number 1, and trailed by horseback riding as number 16. The same study cited the following policy:

> Summer homes shall be permitted only on slopes which exceed 15% except as otherwise authorized by the Regional Forester, and on such slopes which are not and which will not bee [sic] needed even remotely for uses of a higher priority (Sweeley 1937:3)

Resource considerations were being given high priority. The first policy listed was that: "The preservation and protection of natural and historic features will be provided before the construction of any improvement is attempted". Other uses, particularly those that

served the general public, such as camping, picnicking, resorts and hotels, organization camps, and motoring, were being given higher priority (*Ibid.*).

If these major concerns--over the role of recreation in the Forest Service and the potential for monopolizing public recreation sites--existed from the beginning, why did the Forest Service support the Term Occupancy Permits Act, and why did its entire early recreation program revolve around permitted recreation facilities? Some of the more practical reasons have been stated. There was a need to control recreation for public health and resource protection. While not legitimized in policy, recreation residences were an important source of revenue. And, recreation, while not one of the original *raison d'etre* of the agency, was an ongoing and growing use, and the permit process allowed the agency to oversee this use with a minimum of investment.

Also, if recreation residences were considered a lower priority in the spectrum of recreation uses, why did they often occupy sites with the greatest scenic and recreation potential? Rangers and their staffs used Waugh's guidelines extensively over the decades when most residences were built, and this might help explain why so many residences occupied choice sites despite earlier concerns about monopolizing (Berg 1975:6, 104, 138, 142). Over time there was a shift in public perception of the suitability of forest lands for recreation. But also, simply, rangers succumbing to public pressure and a de facto prior use, clearly played a part in the development of recreation residences, and in the extensive occupation of stream sides and lakefronts. But the reasons were more complex than this. Recreation and recreation residences must be seen in the context of the fledgling agency trying to define itself.

Early Controversies and Their Relation to Recreation Residences

There were other factors, which complicated this already convoluted story. Harold Steen, in his history of the Forest Service, suggested that at least part of the agency's interest in recreation development in the early decades might have resulted from competition with the newly created National Park System, and the subsequent creation of National Parks out of National Forests (Steen 1976:116-117; Tweed 1980:5). Steen also made another remarkable connection. He pointed out that Henry Graves, Chief Forester (1910-1920), found it unfortunate that:

> ...during earlier conservation campaigns foresters had found it necessary to advocate use so strongly in order to counteract western opposition to forest reserves. This earlier strategy had precluded the opportunity to support parks and recreation (Steen 1976:121).

Thus, two early conflicts, the so-called western states opposition to forest reserves, and competition with the newly created National Park Service, came together in a cause and effect relationship.

The Public Domain and States' Rights - The controversy over public domain and states' rights has been covered in detail in other studies (McCarthy 1995; Steen

1976:113-122; Cawley 1993; and others); but, in essence, the creation of forest reserves in 1891, and the subsequent increase in government control, were seen by the western states as major infringements on private and states' rights. For a century, federal government policies had favored disposal of the public domain to private individuals. However, with the creation of forest reserves, the western states thought they were witnessing, "the beginning of a generation of revenue-generating landlordism" (McCarthy 1992: 11). The commercial orientation of the Forest Service would have certainly reinforced this perception. Thomas H. Carter of Montana, at the National Wool Grower's Association convention, said that Gifford Pinchot, because he was enthusiastically devoted to forestry, was so:

> ...driven to the necessity of getting money out of the forestry under his control, he determined, amongst other things, to charge a grazing fee for all livestock permitted to range within forest reservations (Author unknown ND: 89).

The focal point of this controversy surrounded grazing rights and new grazing fees that had been established. Like recreation, grazing was not one of the reasons for creating forest reserves; and it, too, was seen as a means of securing revenue through a permit. Grazing had no more legal standing than recreation, but it was an important economic and symbolic venture, especially in the west, and recreation was still a growing concern; perhaps that was why, at first, grazing's control was more controversial.

There was a strong move on the part of Congress in 1907 to pass legislation bringing grazing under its control, and to institute a permit process for grazing rights. While the western states in general fought the notion of federal lands, there was no state more bent on opposing forest reserves and promoting state's rights to grazing than Colorado. Congressional representation from Colorado was decidedly anticonservation. Democrat Alva Adams launched a campaign for "home rule" to force federal cession of public domain lands to the states, and the state legislature called for a public lands convention to be held in Denver. But at that convention, Gifford Pinchot stood up to the ranchers, apparently refuting their arguments, and the state's rights movement faltered after this show down, though the issue never really went away (McCarthy 1995:10; Rowley 1985:65).

The point of this comparison is that similar concerns must have existed in the minds of the early recreating public. Now, recreationists were to be charged through a permit system for what before had been free. Berg (1975:86) alluded to this connection when he pointed out that some western legislators, pressured by special interest groups, attempted to pass legislation, such as the 12 February 1915 Raker bill, which would have allowed summer residence homesteads and been detrimental to the Forest Service (see Chapter 3).

Several years later, the Forest Supervisor for the Pike National Forest expressed strong concerns about the private-public nature of recreation residences. His concerns undoubtedly had their basis in the controversy over forest reserves controlling the public domain. He wrote about the 1915 Occupancy Permits Act:

> Just what the sponsors of this law had in mind originally was Uncle Sam, realtor–not landlord as it turned out...the act was known, for a while, at least to the average citizen, as the five acre homestead law (Keithley 1929:246).

and,

> That there are dangers ahead in our leasing system is to be found in no less an authority than the report of the joint committee on Recreational Survey of Federal Lands, which states: 'In many instances, therefore, the leasing of land for summer home sites may be looked upon as the initial step in passing these residential sites into private ownership (*Ibid.*:248).

He went on to say:

> It is not stretching the imagination to predict private ownership of all exclusive use areas which we now have under permit as well as those to be some handled in the future (*Ibid.*).

And, certainly, these early statements foreshadowed the modern controversy surrounding recreation residences. But perhaps, in fact, the permit process was somewhat of a compromise. While the federal government administered the reserves, private citizens at least maintained a role in forest use, if just as "renters".

Competition with the National Park Service - Shortly following this confrontation over states' rights, another issue, growing public support for a park agency, emerged. Chief Forester Henry Graves was caught in a position of wanting to support this idea and even to incorporate parks into the Forest Service, but was unable or unwilling to take focus away from timber and water uses. It seemed that his hands were tied by the Forest Service mission that his agency had been forced to defend against the hostile western states. And so, in 1916, a new park bureau was established within the Department of Interior. Parks were not put under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service, because supposedly, at least in part, it could not be trusted to keep parks free of logging, grazing, and, even summer home development (Steen 1976:118-119). Stephen Mather, new head of the National Park Service, even challenged the idea that the Forest Service should be engaged in recreation at all (*Ibid.*:158; Tweed 1980:11).

One year after creation of the Park Service, the Forest Service hired Frank A. Waugh to study recreation facilities on National Forests and make recommendations on how to develop and administer them. Steen pointed out that this was hardly a coincidence (Steen 1976:120); the agency needed a strategy to stand its ground on recreation. Waugh emphasized the then-current issue of the Grand Canyon, which later, in 1919, became a national park, and stated Forest Service opposition to further carving up of forests to create additional national parks (Waugh 1917:16, 137-145). In his report, Waugh defended the two independent programs, and wanted his readers to believe that there were many similarities between the two agencies' recreation programs (*Ibid.*:127-129).

But, in fact, what he described was a decidedly different approach to outdoor recreation from the Park Service. Waugh acknowledged that in the National Forests, recreation was at first ignored and later only tolerated (Waugh 1917:111). Invoking the "highest use" principle, he stated that it was time to frankly recognize, appraise, protect, and assist recreation in fair comparison to other forest uses (*Ibid.*:111-112). He then cited examples of exclusive recreation use already set aside—a campground on the Columbia River Highway, resorts in the canyons above Los Angeles, and, "...miles on miles of canyon and lake-front surveyed for summer home permits" (*Ibid.*:130). In fact, most of Waugh's study was devoted to describing permitted recreation uses of National Forests, and, in particular, recreation residences. Waugh concluded that the differences between the two agencies were "almost wholly administrative" (*Ibid.*:129). However, the difference between the Forest Service philosophy of highest use, and the National Park Service philosophy—or rather charter—of exclusive use was more than just administrative. This was a critical difference. In reality, the permit was the Forest Service's recreation strategy.

The Park Service only permitted recreation residences in early 1964 when two tracts were developed, and even then, probably because of political pressure (Berg 1975:127). That policy was reviewed shortly thereafter, and the program terminated. The only other residences the Park Service administers existed prior to lands gaining park status, for example, the Mineral King tracts in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, which were originally Forest Service (Carr and McNiel 1999).

Congress' reluctance to fund Forest Service recreation was, in part, due to the ill-defined differences between National Forests and National Parks (Tweed 1980:11). However, having lost the opportunity to manage parks and lacking appropriations, the Forest Service, once again, was left with only one option, permitted recreation. This might explain the contradictory statements concerning permits as income. On the one hand, the agency wanted to be actively responsive to public recreation needs, and, on the other, it needed to show it could generate revenues from recreation use.

Over the years, the gulf between the agencies only grew. A few years later, the Forest Service began to promote the differences:

> It is not the purpose of the Forest Service to duplicate within the National Forests the functions, methods, or activities of National, State, or municipal park services, nor to compete with such parks for public patronage or support (Author unknown 1920s:1).

In 1931, Chief Stuart called for clearer distinctions between Park Service and Forest Service programs, admitting that the Forest Service viewed recreation primarily from the standpoint of sanitation and fire prevention (Steen 1976:209).

Controversies Continue – the Second 30 Years

The New Deal Era - Despite early concerns, and for the practical and political reasons discussed above, the Forest Service continued to develop, even promote, recreation residences for the first 30 years of the program. However, the next 30 years of recreation residence history witnessed some important shifts in philosophy and agency priorities. Forest policy on recreation seemed to have shifted dramatically in the 1930s, from an emphasis on permitted recreation residences to more broadly based public recreation (Dodd 1995:21; Palmer and Cole 1998:16). On the Santa Barbara National Forest (now the Los Padres), the 1939 forest recreation plan described this shift in thinking:

> About 1916 the Forest Service started providing facilities for cabins, many summer homes being built in chosen locations. Later developments and demands have proven that the amount of use, income, and many other problems arising from the use of these areas make it appear that these same places may have been put to a much higher use. Public camps and picnic grounds in this vicinity are over crowded and large groves of native oak are endangered by excessive trampling of ground. Little used cabin site in the same canyon take up many valuable sites much needed for expansion and use by a much greater number of people (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest 1939:2; Palmer and Cole 1998:16).

Under the fiscally conservative administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, Forest Service recreation policy had essentially been to simply provide the settings for recreation opportunities, allowing private facilities, such as resorts and summer homes, to serve the public's recreational needs. Then, President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal emphasized community over individual rights, and public over private interests (Palmer and Cole 1998:16; Dodd 1995: 20-22). To provide employment and stimulate the economy, the federal government began funding resource conservation and development projects. Forest Service recreation energies were diverted to public works projects. Forest workers who had formerly designed and surveyed recreation residence tracts were now designing and constructing public campgrounds, picnic areas, trails, roads, lodges, and other recreation, not to mention administrative, facilities. Funding to support the work of thousands of Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees greatly expanded the Forest Service recreation public works program (Tweed 1980:15-26; Bean and Rawls 1988: 266, 273, 300; Dodd 1995:5-6).

Recreation residence tract development and management emphases declined during the New Deal era, virtually stopped during World War II, and then returned at a slow pace after the war (Berg 1975:91). The recreation residence emphasis began to decline in the 1930s, not merely because of the Depression, as tract development and permit issuances continued then, but because of the philosophical change in recreation management. But other less altruistic reasons might have played a role in this change as well. As suggested by the Los Padres recreation plan, forests might have begun to realize that the income generated by permitting residences did not balance favorably against the costs to administer them. Also, Doug Dodd, in his report on Los Padres recreation residences,

suggested that the need for homeowners to serve as fire lookouts and fighters decreased with the presence of Civilian Conservation Corps crews (Dodd 1995:20).

Economic and Environmental Concerns – As development of recreation residences slowed, following the New Deal Era and the economic depression following World War II, controversy surrounding recreation residences grew. Over the next 30 years, several factors worked in favor of continuing this special use, while other concerns worked against its favor. Pressure on the part of local communities and the Forest Service's close ties to local economies came up against the fact that costs to administer permits had gradually outweighed revenues (Berg 1975:107). Then in the 1960s, broad based environmental concerns grew on the part of the general public. At the same time, homeowners grew as a political force and resisted efforts to reclaim the sites for other more public uses (Berg 1975:110).

During the early years, fee revenues were a significant source of income for forests, (for example, in 1920, income for the Angeles was $22,000 (Berg 1975:105)), but by the 1950s, the revenues had become relatively out of step with inflation, and administration of the permits was costing the Forest Service more than it was receiving in revenues. For example, costs, such as fire protection for residences in rural areas, had increased substantially. At the same time, land values were increasing in areas where the recreation tourist industry was growing, and the general public was perceived to be subsidizing the recreation residence owner. A 1963 General Accounting Office review of the fee schedule was an important turning point. This report found that the fees charged in California for recreation residence permits were often substantially less than fees computed, in accordance with Forest Service instructions, on the basis of comparable private lands (TheComptroller General of the United States 1963:16-17; Berg 1975:107).

On the other hand, counties shared in the profits through a portion of the fees that were returned for their use. In 1908 Congress had passed legislation providing for 25 percent of the fees generated from permitted activities, including recreation, to be paid to the counties for schools and roads. A substantial portion of the local government's budget was derived from these so called lieu taxes, particularly in the southern counties where logging fees were not large. At the same time, the California Revenue and Taxation Code authorized counties to levy a property tax on the dwelling and its improvements. As the fees and taxes increased over the years, so did the county coffers, and so did resistance to Forest Service efforts to reduce the number of permits.

In the 1950s and 60s, the highest use issue reared its head again. This, combined with new environmental concerns, has kept recreation residences in a fairly constant state of controversy. As year round use increased, so did the needs of homeowners for improved roads, snow removal, water, and waste management improvements, and so did the inevitable impacts. Increased populations within the state, with their increased recreation use pressure, exacerbated the conflicts with the homeowners and the general public. Residences front on some of the most beautiful lakes and streams in the state, areas that the general public, on the one hand, want to use, but that are also more vulnerable to environmental degradation. At the same time, the homeowners, over the generations,

have made substantial financial and emotional investments in their homes. And because they have become a powerful voice in Congress, they have successfully stood their ground against considerable controversy.

Nearly all of the issues, while taking on a more modern tone, can be traced to the early origins and controversies surrounding this permitted use. Recreation use on national forests continues to increase, and the highest use and the appropriateness of permitted residences questions still confound administrators of national forests. Permitted recreation is the primary means the agency has, given existing policy, budgets, and personnel, to meet the recreating public's needs, and permitting of recreation residences is now a long-established institution in the agency. Public domain versus private rights, continues to be at the core of this controversy. Ironically, the Forest Service can be said to have out-done the National Park Service in this one arena; the Forest Service is the only agency that went full tilt into the recreation residence business. When all is said and done, the recreation residence phenomenon has had a substantial impact on the agency, the homeowners, the recreating public, and the landscape.

CHAPTER 3

PERMIT HISTORY AND ADMINISTRATION

In California during the latter half of the 19th century, the practice of establishing summer homes on lands in the public domain evolved from local miners, loggers, and ranchers taking their families to the mountains, while wealthier valley families and sports enthusiasts built cabins in the mountains as private recreational or hunting lodges. As cities developed in the low lands, families sometimes moved to the mountains temporarily to escape urban life and summer heat (Ayres and Hutchinson 1927:15; Berg 1975:66-68; Dodd 1995:10). Then, the Forest Reserves Act of 1891 (also referred to as the Creative Act of 1891, or An Act to Repeal the Timber-Culture Laws; 26 Stat. 1103; 16 U.S.C. 471) authorized the President to set aside forest reserves, under the jurisdiction of the General Land Office of the Department of Interior. When the forest reserves were created out of public domain lands, many of these early summer cabins fell under reserve jurisdiction.

In 1897, a process began to formalize this prior and on-going practice of establishing summer cabins on what had become federal forest reserves. The first authority for doing this was found in the Organic Administration Act of 1897 (also called the Organic Act, the Forest Management Act, and the Sundry Civil Expenses Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1898; 30 Stat. 11, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 473, et seq.), which defined the purposes of the forest reserves--to conserve timber and water. It established the principal of occupancy and use regulated by permit on reserve lands. This act allowed for hotels, stores, mills, and other establishments to be permitted.

Two years later, the Mineral Springs Leasing Act of 1899 (sometimes called the Terminable Permits Act; 30 Stat. 908; 16 U.S.C. 495) authorized rental or lease of reserve lands adjacent to mineral, medicinal, or other springs for sanitariums or hotels, and authorized regulations for tents or temporary dwellings, for the convenience of people visiting such springs for health or pleasure. Geographer Donald Berg, in a dissertation entitled *Second Homes on the National Forests*, pointed out that although the Mineral Springs Leasing law did not specifically mention recreation residences, its language was broad enough to accommodate permitting them (Berg 1975:70-71).

The Organic Act and Terminable Permits

Rather than relying on the Mineral Springs Leasing Act for its authority, the agency actually used a standard terminable permit, implemented under the Organic Act. The Organic Act, then (Pinchot 1905:207-208), and today, provided the primary permitting authority for the Forest Service--for all sorts of permitted activities (e.g., powerline permits, communications facility permits, special event permits, even archaeological survey permits), not just for recreation residences.

Over the next few years, issuance of terminable annual permits expanded rapidly; and early, albeit simple, policy and guidelines for administering permits were established.

The 1902 General Land Office manual for managing the reserves provided for permitting sanitariums and hotels (Tweed 1980:2). Early in 1905, administration of the forest reserves was transfered to the Department of Agriculture (Transfer Act of February 1, 1905; 33 Stat. 628; 16 U.S.C. 472, et seq.). Later that year, the first published Forest Service Use Book stated, in regulation 42, that:

Hotels, stores, mills, summer residences, and similar establishments will be allowed upon reserve lands wherever the demand is legitimate and consistent with the best interests of the reserve (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1905:49).

This was reiterated in the 1906 Report of the Forester:

> ...forest reserve resources are for the use of the people and no privileges will be denied unless their exercise materially interferes with reserve interests or threatens harm to the public....a reasonable charge should be made for all such use whenever the permit involves withdrawal of the particular resource or land from use by the people in general (Pinchot 1907:10-11).

The 1913 Report of the Forester was the first to mention recreation as an activity on the Forests, and recreation permit uses. According to the report, most of the recreation permits were issued for cottages and permanent summer camps. The report states:

> Recreation use of the Forests is growing very rapidly, especially on Forests near cities of considerable size. Hundreds of canyons and lake shores are now dotted with camps and cottages built on land use of which is obtained through permits of the Forest Service. This is a highly important form of use of the Forests by the public, and it is recognized and facilitated by adjusting commercial use of the Forests, when necessary, to the situation created by the needs of the recreation seekers. Examples of such adjustment are the exclusion of stock from localities where they would interfere with such a summer population...and provision in timber sales for very light cutting, or no cutting at all, close to lakes and elsewhere where it is desireable to preserve the natural beauty of the location unmarred, for the enjoyment of the public (Graves 1913:41-42).

During the same year, in California, the Stanislaus National Forest started receiving numerous requests for summer camp sites along forest roads. In 1914, the Forest Supervisor, R. W. Ayres, issued a circular to his District Rangers providing guidelines for recreation residences. He directed them to permit such uses as residences, even if only tents were used; limited the maximum acreage to three acres; established annual rental fees of $5 for the first acre, and $2.50 for each additional half acre up to the three acres maximum; and directed the Districts to survey tracts for residence permits where the demand was high. For all surveyed tracts, he directed that care should be taken to maximize lay-out, so as not to monopolize the best land, and to always allow camping places for transients. This early circular predated the act that one year later would generate major recreation residence development; and, it set standards that were used for years (Ayres 1914).

Permits were addressed more specifically in the 1906 version of the Use Book, which stipulated: "Forest Supervisors issuing permits should always make them 'terminable at the discretion of the Forester' and not for any definite period" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1906:64). This was, and still is, the practice for terminable permits. Because of this, though, the system was criticized for its lack of long term security. Recreation residence permits could be reviewed annually and terminated. Permittees argued that they needed longer tenure to justify their construction investment (Berg 1975:87; Supernowicz and Richford 1987:4; Dodd 1995:14-15).

The Occupancy Permits Act and Term Permits

In the 1910s, summer home owners lobbied for new legislation aimed at establishing more secure ownership. Permittees approached California Congressman John E. Raker (a San Franciscan, and also legislative architect for Hetch Hetchy Reservoir) about their concerns. In February, 1915, he introduced a bill in the House that would have allowed summer residence homesteads on parcels of up to ten acres on public land that had been certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as not necessary for public use (Berg 1975:86; Supernowicz and Richford 1987:5; Dodd 1995:14-15). Raker's bill, which never made it out of committee hearings, would have put the land into private ownership.

In part, as a result of the permittee lobbying (Berg 1975:87; Supernowicz and Richford 1987:5; Conners 1993:4; Dodd 1995:14-15), and with strong support from the Forest Service (Tweed 1980:3), Congress instead passed the Occupancy Permits Act (also called the Term Permits Act; 38 Stat. 1101, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 497), on March 4, 1915. It authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to permit hotels, resorts, summer homes, stores, and other buildings for commercial and public purposes. It allowed use and occupancy of areas within the National Forests, not to exceed five acres for summer homes, for periods not exceeding thirty years. The Occupancy Permits Act put limits on the types of allowable improvements, established the acreage appropriate for each use, determined the term of use, and kept the land in federal ownership (Conners 1993:4; Dodd 1995:14-15). Subsequent Reports of the Forester emphasized Forest Service opposition to Raker's proposed summer homesteading and the advantages of maintaining federal ownership, so that lands could be regulated for the benefit of the general public, the integrity of the Forests maintained, and sanitary and other precautions regulated (Graves 1916:22; Greeley 1920:19).

Henry S. Graves, Forester in the Washington Office, in his agency *Instructions Regarding Term Occupancy Permits*, stated that: "The purpose of the act is to make the National Forests more available than hitherto for recreation uses" (Graves 1915b:1). Graves' instructions (*Ibid.*:2-3) and the Forest Service Use Book (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1915:137-138) of that same year contain the following direction related to summer homes:

> a) That the permittee observe all the regulations of the Department of Agriculture relating to the National Forests;

b) That premises be kept in a neat and orderly condition and...observe such other sanitary requirements as may at any time appear necessary to protect the public health;

c) That improvements be constructed within a reasonable time and in accordance with plans and specifications filed with the forest officers...;

d) That all reasonable caution be taken to prevent forest fires...;

f) That timber shall be removed only under permit from forest officers;

g) That a fair annual rental be paid for the use of the land occupied;

h) That structures may be removed within a reasonable time after the permit is terminated...;

i) That a right of way be reserved for the free ingress and egress of forest officers, and other users of National Forest lands as well as for the removal of products of the Forest;

k) That on the expiration of the permit the permittee shall be considered the first applicant for a new permit....

The Occupancy Permits Act set acreage limits for summer homes at five acres. However, the Forester directed in his instructions for implementing the Act that: "Ordinarily 1 acre, or even less, would suffice" (Graves 1915b:1). The Occupancy Permits Act set term limits at 30 years. However, the Forester directed in his instructions, and incorporated into the 1915 Use Book, a term limit of 15 years to be authorized by district foresters (*Ibid.*:3; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1915:136). Graves actually directed continuing the use of terminable permits unless considerable expenditure on improvements and resultant long-term occupancy would be needed (Graves 1915b:1). It seems that the Forest Service was not ready to take the act to its fullest limits.

Despite the new tool of term permits available to rangers, comparatively few of the permits written after 1915 were under the Occupancy Permits Act (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969c:XIII-25; Berg 1975:87; Dodd 1995:14-15). This was apparently a reflection of the agency's desire to keep recreation residence sites maximally discretionary (Graves 1915b:1; Conners 1993:4). However, it also may have been based upon misconceptions on the part of permittees about long term leasing, because terminable permits under the Organic Act did not have specific expiration dates (although they did have to be renewed annually), and were often misinterpreted as lasting in perpetuity. It may have been the use of terminable permits well beyond the 1915 Act that contributed to the prevalent myth of the "99-year lease" (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and

Mendenhall 1969a & b:II-92-93; Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969c:XIII-26-27; Berg 1975:74-75, 87-88).

Additionally, Graves' instructions directed that the minimum annual fee for a summer home permit under the Occupancy Permits Act was not to be less than $10; but, the minimum fee for a terminable permit issued under the Organic Act could be as low as $5 (Graves 1915b:3). On monetary considerations alone, a terminable permit may have been more attractive to homeowners.

Immediately following this initial establishment of the program, Region 5 began to lay out recreation residence tracts (see Chapter 6). A 1916 report by the California District Forester provided some the earliest guidelines for the summer homes in tracts. They included requirements that building plans be approved by forest officers and that unsightly buildings not be allowed to disfigure the landscape (DuBois 1916).

Evolution of Recreation Residence Guidance

In 1918, Frank A. Waugh, a landscape architect from the Massachusetts Agricultural College at Amherst, consulting for the Forest Service, looked at the design needs for forest developments, including recreation residence tracts. He cited as one of landscape engineering's primary objectives the need to preserve the native landscape in its pristine beauty. Waugh cautioned Forest Supervisors to anticipate the demand for summer home colonies, and to ensure that, "...the building of disreputable, unsightly structures which disfigure the natural landscape surroundings" be prevented by rigorous means. He went on to describe various summer home tract designs that blended with the environment, and identified lot spacing needs (Waugh 1918a:5, 19, 10). Waugh's report would be cited by the Forest Service as the primary guideline for summer home tract design (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District 1924:7). In another publication, Waugh cited tract development as a fascinating study in town planning; he noted: "Streets must be laid out, lots surveyed, water supply protected, sanitary precautions insured, and provisions made for...a full-fledged and active community" (Waugh 1918b:23). Waugh's early landscape guidelines set the stage for Forest Service recreation residence development.

During the 1920s, recreation residence policy was starting to exhibit more stringent direction. On March 1, 1924, the California District issued a Recreation and Special Use Administrative Guide (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District 1924). Although the guide dealt with all Forest Service recreation and special use activities, from administrative sites and apiaries to telephone connections and water development, the majority of the 60 page guide was devoted to recreation residence policy and management, including such topics as how to lay out and survey tracts, and guidelines for permit clauses. Minimum rental charges were established for recreation residences, at $15 for terminable or revocable permits, and $25 for term permits (*Ibid.*:37), and a $250 minimum improvement investment (*Ibid.*:55) was required. A standard permit format was established, with a list of standard and recommended clauses, including the management and health and safety guidelines established earlier by Graves,

plus many additional clauses including those that: required all buildings to be permanent in nature and of a neat appearance, and their locations approved by forest officers; cited provable disorderly or objectionable conduct as cause for permit revocation; and required conformance with association rules and regulations (*Ibid.*:47-50). Forests were cautioned to consider adding the standard "higher use" stipulation to permits where there was a possibility for a higher future use of the land, such as for water development or road construction (*Ibid.*:39, 47). This was to be echoed many times over in the years to come.

On January 26, 1927, the guide was amended with two additional pages of summer home guidelines. Included were standards that required Forest Service approval of rough plans for all cabins prior to construction; that all cabins be painted or stained which were not built of stone, cement, tile, logs, slabs, shingles, or shakes; and that at least 25 foot front setbacks be maintained for buildings on all lots. These guidelines were primarily geared to ensuring against "old shack" type building construction, and required permittees to remodel such buildings to current standards. They were also geared to ensuring that permanent buildings were in keeping with their surroundings (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District 1927:55a-55b).

As an example, in the San Bernardino recreation atlas and plan, the simple stipulations from the early Use Books were giving way to requirements for careful planning of developments. "No special use recreational surveys will be undertaken until after a careful plan of the area has been made...."; and, "It will be the policy not to continually add lots to existing tracts to accommodate some applicant and lots will not be divided for the same reason after being regularly surveyed and mapped...."; and, "No special use sites will be surveyed within 100 feet of the center of road right of way on principal highways, or within 60 feet of center of other through roads" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest 1928).

More specific requirements were now being put on San Bernardino permittees too. For recreation residence terminable permits, an expenditure of not less than $500 was required; for term permits, expenditure of not less than $2,000 was required. All frame buildings had to be painted or stained, and no "loud" colors were permitted; fireproof roofing materials were required; and chemical toilets were required (*Ibid.*). Similar stipulations were also found in the Eldorado recreation plan from the same era (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest 1926).

By the end of the 1920s, the Forest Service was starting to rethink its recreation policies. Some Forests were realizing that the demand for recreation by the general public was greater than anticipated years earlier (Berg 1975:103). The San Bernardino National Forest acknowledged early-on that: "...summer home site tracts were laid out years ago when the great increase in population and future use was not foreseen and some of the tracts are today needed for public use" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest 1928). That preference was to be given to recreation uses on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number, was soon to be echoed throughout the Forest Service (this was a principle originally expressed in a letter sent to Gifford Pinchot, the first Forester, by Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson, on

February 1, 1905, the date of the Transfer Act (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1993:11-12); the letter was actually authored by Pinchot). The San Bernardino went on to set policy in 1928 to limit further development in certain areas, to cancel permits when opportunities arose and convert those permit areas to public use; and to put no new tracts in areas obviously needed for general public recreation.

Echoing earlier policy from the San Bernardino, and in keeping with the renewal of a more public oriented Forest Service philosophy of the New Deal era, the Cleveland National Forest set recreation policy in 1942 to consider "...the best land management for the greatest number of people in the long run" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Cleveland National Forest 1942:IV-3). But, then, the policy for changing uses in specific areas became more directive:

> WHERE SPECIAL USE BUILDINGS are now located on areas needed for higher use in land management, the permittees will be notified of the condition and be given a reasonable period of time, not exceeding 15 years, within which to liquidate their investments and remove their improvements (*Ibid.* 3).

A clause was to be added to permits specifying that the Forest Service reserved the right to reconsider cancellation or reissuance of the permit to adjust for proper land usage (*Ibid.*:IV-5).

Permittee stipulations were becoming more specific. Building plans and siting still had to be approved by the Forest Supervisor prior to construction. Residence improvements had to be completed within two summer seasons of permit issuance. But, also, buildings were limited to one residence, one garage, and one outhouse on each lot. All buildings had to be stained or oiled according to existing standards. Roofing had to be of fire resistant materials of approved standards. A standard spark arrestor had to be placed over each chimney outlet. All chimneys had to be of brick, stone, or terracotta enclosed in a steel jacket. Wastewater had to be piped to a fly proof cesspool located below any water supply used for domestic purposes. Sanitary improvements had to be approved before installation. Signs had to be unobtrusive and required approval. All fences required approval. No tent platforms were permitted (*Ibid*:X11-X13; X20-21).

Many other permit clauses were included. Interestingly enough, minimum expenditure limits were set at $500 for terminable permits--the same as on the San Bernardino in 1928--and at $1,000 for term permits--half the limit of the San Bernardino's 14 years earlier (*Ibid.*:X-20). A permit example from the Sequoia National Forest, dated 1945, contained similar permit clauses (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Sequoia National Forest 1945). The increased specificity in the permits and guidelines was generally aimed at ensuring that Forest resources were protected, that health and safety precautions were taken, that improvements harmonized with the environment, and that needs for general public recreation uses were considered.

The 1940s saw even more specific recreation residence policy and guidelines. The California Region issued another Administrative Guide for Special Uses, in 1946 (U.S.

Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region 1946). In contrast to the 1924 edition, this Guide devoted considerably less, though still substantial, space to recreation residences. Virtually the entire section from the 1924 Guide on how to lay out and survey tracts had been deleted; designing summer home tracts was no longer a priority.

However, the standards for design, construction, and maintenance of recreation residences were definitely more specific than those issued in 1924; and, they continued to reference Frank Waugh's landscape engineering principles (*Ibid.*:30). Emphasis was placed on adapting buildings to the site: minimizing foundations; using building materials suitable to the forest setting, preferably native materials; requiring integrated, substantial construction; utilizing the existing landscape, and prohibiting use of exotic species and "man-made" yard decorations (*Ibid*).

The building materials section was quite specific, citing suitable materials as natural, peeled, hewed, or sawed logs; unplanned better than planed sawed lumber; stained rather than painted finish; and local stone. Brick, cement, stucco, tin, and similar materials were cited as unsuitable (*Ibid.*).

Building design emphasized inconspicuousness, integration, and uniformity. Simplicity was touted as the keynote for good design: "'Gingerbread work' and 'Dodads' of every sort are highly unsuited to forest camps...." and, "Everything ornate, elaborate, pretentious, showy, tricky, fussy or peculiar is necessarily bad" (*Ibid.*:30-31)

Permittee associations were still encouraged (*Ibid*:36). One certainly foresighted policy was that discrimination could not be made on the basis of race, color, creed, or alien status for issuance of special use permits (*Ibid.*:11).

Region 5 issued an amendment to its Administrative Guide for Special Uses, March 11, 1947 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5 1947:73). Its guidance emphasized that permits were not to be issued for summer homes outside surveyed and approved tracts. In keeping with the more general public recreation oriented theme, it contained regional guidance on permit termination:

> Occasionally good management or land use classification dictates the discontinuance of summer home use, and under the following conditions permits will be placed on a definite tenure in accordance with the policy for amortization of improvements:
> (1) Where land occupied by a summer home is needed for a higher use.
> (2) Where serious conflict exists with our roadside policy.
> (3) Where improvements are sub-standard and permittee will take no action to remedy conditions.

In 1955, the Forest Service Manual was amended to require Chief's approval for establishment of all new recreation residence tracts. Recommendations for approval had to demonstrate that proposed areas were not needed for present or future nonexclusive

recreation use, either because ample other areas existed for general public use or that proposed summer home areas were not environmentally suited for public use. Proposals also had to demonstrate that recreation residence use would not interfere with other forest uses. They had to include financial statements about costs, amortization charges, and expected rental incomes; and they had to be accompanied by map data of all recreation areas, and roadside and waterfront zones, within five miles, plus sketch maps of proposed tracts (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1955:19). Requiring all new developments to be approved at the Washington Office level effectively put a damper on establishing new tracts--particularly for an agency where decentralization to the regional or Forest level was the norm.

In the 1950s, recreation residence policy on the National Forests in California strongly emphasized the priority of public uses.

> Summer homes may only be permitted on areas which because of topography or location are unsuitable for public use, or on areas which as far as can be foreseen will not be needed for present or future public use and where the presence of summer homes will not interfere with public needs on other areas....In order to prevent unnecessary intrusion into the forest scene and interference with general public uses, summer homes are not allowed within sight of highways or lakes, along fishing streams, near public use areas, or near scenic attractions (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region 1959).

Only one residence was allowed, to be used only for recreation purposes, not as a permanent residence. The policy still required that summer home plans be approved by the Forest Supervisor, that building be completed within two years, that the lot be maintained in an orderly condition, and that structures harmonize with the forest environment. By this time, toilet and garbage disposal had to meet state and county sanitation laws and Forest Service regulations (*Ibid*). The same information, almost quoted word for word, was published in a journal, still essentially extolling the virtues of summer homes on National Forests (Bellomy 1956). However, a note at the top of a copy of the policy hand-out for the public stated: "As of August 1959 there are no new summer home lots available in the California Region, and this situation will prevail for at least a year" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region 1959).

Continuing to follow the regional Administrative Guide for Special Uses revised in 1946, a set of design standards was routinely included with recreation residence Special Use Permits. The standards for harmonizing with the environment were very explicit. The building should "fit" the ground, with low foundations fewer than two feet in height. Building materials should be suitable to the forest, and of materials native to the locality; sawed and unplanned lumber and local stone were encouraged. Walls, windows and doors, roofs, and porches should blend together as an integrated and substantial whole, not be haphazard or hit-or-miss. Again, design should be simple, without unnecessary decoration, "do-dads", or "dolling up" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Mendocino National Forest 1958).

Changes to Come

In 1963, the General Accounting Office, at the request of Congress, investigated Forest Service recreation residence fee policies. It found that fees collected were less than computed under Forest Service guidelines, and that the government was losing significant revenues. Forest Service handbook instructions for determining fees for summer home use were that rates be calculated based on five percent of the value of comparable private lands used for similar purposes, with a minimum rental of $25 a year. However, the review found that this guidance was not generally being followed (The Comptroller General of the United States 1963:6-7, 15; Berg 1975:107).

A major portion of the review was conducted in Region 5, then the California Region, at the regional office in San Francisco, and on the Eldorado, Inyo, San Bernardino, Sierra, Stanislaus, and Tahoe National Forests. In general, fees collected were found to be lower than national Forest Service guidelines. Using the Eldorado as an example, the General Accounting Office determined that the Forest collected $138,000 less in fees than it should have, had the Forest Service guideline of 5% of market value been followed. The review determined that regional direction lowered the fees charged. Annual fees computed based on regional guidance were between $47 and $95, compared to the appraisal calculations of $115 to $250 by the Eldorado using the Forest Service 5% of market value national guideline. The regional office explanation for this was that land values had rapidly increased, and the regional fee guidance represented up to 100% increases versus the several hundred percent increases the Forest Service national guidance would require. Although not stated, the implication was that higher increases would put a burden on, or be objected to, by permittees. The Comptroller's recommendations were that fees be adjusted as soon as possible to provide a fair return to the government (The Comptroller General of the United States 1963:7-8, 1, 15-23, 26-27).

Following the review, the Forest Service appraised permit sites, and raised fees. Region 5 did this in 1963, and again five years later, in 1968 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Mendocino National Forest 1968). However, since the appraisals resulted in substantial fee increases, the Forest Service decided to phase them in incrementally over five years, to appease permittees. The end result of that policy meant that the fees were again below market value by the time they were fully implemented (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969a & b:II-94, II-105; Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969d:XVIII-18-19).

In 1965, Congress established the Public Land Law Review Commission to review public land uses and occupancy, and to make recommendations for changes in existing laws, regulations, policies, and practices related to public land management. One review focus was private uses of public lands, including recreation residences. The Commission contracted with a private firm, Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall, to complete a study, upon which the Commission substantially based its findings; that study was printed in a series of four volumes plus a summary (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969a-e). For the recreation residence portion, the study concentrated on the

Forest Service, because it administered 99% of summer home uses, and on the California Region, because it had the most summer homes. The consultants looked at agency and permittee views, and also utilized legal and census data. The Commission then looked at all the data gathered during the review, and, in 1970, ultimately recommended that public lands should not be made available for private vacation home purposes, and that such existing uses should be eliminated (Public Land Law Review Commission 1970:223-224; Berg 1975:136-137).

Halting Program Development

However, even earlier than that published finding, the Congressional and General Accounting Office scrutiny, coupled with the Forest Service's own changed recreation emphasis to higher public use opportunities, led to discontinuation of recreation residence tract development. In an address to the 57th Pacific Logging Conference, in San Francisco, in 1966, the Chief of the Forest Service stated that further concessions for private cabin sites were unlikely, emphasizing that the Forest Service was concentrating its recreation funding on public campgrounds, picnic sites, and winter sports areas (Christiansen 1966:60; Berg 1975:89). In 1968, the Chief issued a moratorium on the recreation residence development program, fixing the number of tracts; then, in 1976, he expanded the moratorium to include no development of new lots within existing tracts (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office, Lands 1993:6). A 1979 recreation residence statement emphasized this policy: "...there are no longer opportunities to establish new residential tracts....no additional National Forest private recreation residence sites are planned" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1979).

By the late 1960s, summer home guidelines were explicitly and repeatedly emphasizing harmony with the surrounding environment (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region 1969).

> To the extent feasible, the overall appearance of improvements will be inconspicuous. They will not contrast unnecessarily with natural forms on the site. Design will emphasize low and predominately horizontal lines or will duplicate dominant landform lines of the building site or the background (*Ibid.*:2).

Plans had to be approved by the Forest Service prior to construction. Outbuildings were not allowed. Even small structures, such as fences, mailboxes, and television antennas, required approval. The exterior appearance of improvements had to harmonize with the environment, with colors duplicating the natural setting, in soft browns, weathered greys, greens, or light tans, as appropriate. Wood, stone, and roughly textured materials were preferred in order to harmonize with the forest surroundings. But, regional environmental differences were accommodated, and, in desert areas, frame and adobe stucco that blended with the environment were allowed. Large surfaces had to be broken. Trim had to blend with the background and not present strong contrasts. Bright colors and smooth materials, sheet and corrugated metal, and tar paper were not allowed (*Ibid.*:1-4).

In December 1968, the Forest Service Manual was amended to include a section on Future-Use Determination. It essentially set a goal to study all recreation residence tracts or lots to determine if the land should be retained for public uses, retained for recreation residence use, or disposed of into private ownership. At that time, decisions were to be tied to Forest recreation plans (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1968:2345.1). Future use determinations were a great concern to permittees (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969c:XIII-27, 80; Berg 1975:163-164). Their inquiries, and those of Congress instigated on behalf of permittee constituents, eventually led, in 1987, to a Forest Service moratorium on future use studies. The Chief of the Forest Service stated that such studies threatened successful completion of revised Forest Service recreation residence policy, then in draft and comment stages. He stated that the moratorium would alleviate permittee concerns and facilitate completion of the proposed policy (Robertson 1987).

As mentioned earlier, following World War II, recreation residence homeowners began to seriously organize into associations to promote their interests. Berg points out that when the Forest Service began to encourage associations in the 1920s, the agency had no vision of their potential effectiveness as political pressure groups capable of influencing Forest Service policy (Berg 1975:164):

> Given the substantial emotional and financial investments involved, the higher income, better than average education and perhaps more general awareness of the second home permittees, associations of owners clearly have great potential for strong defensive reaction to any threat of the status quo.

Their influence was undoubtedly felt in the regional resistance to raising of fees to meet Forest Service guidelines, noted by the General Accounting Office review (The Comptroller General of the United States 1963; Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969a & b:II-94). Certainly, permittee association influence was, and still is, key to the long-term efforts to resist future use determinations and permit revocations and terminations (Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall 1969c:XIII-80; Berg 1975:108, 151, 158, 164-170; Robertson 1987).

Later Program Guidance

In 1981, Region 5 issued a Forest Service Manual supplement with recreation residence guidelines (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5 1981:2721.23b). Much of the wording in these guidelines followed that of the earlier 1969 guidelines. In 1986, the most recent regional guidelines for recreation residences were implemented as handbook guidance. Again, for most sections, wording essentially copied that of the earlier 1969 and 1981 guidelines, particularly for harmonizing with the surrounding natural environment for colors and materials, including allowances for regional forest or desert conditions, requiring plan and structure approvals, and prohibiting outbuildings. Emphasis was placed on prohibition of year-round, continuous use, and prohibition of use other than for private, forest recreation purposes. Size restrictions were added, limiting

the habitable floor space to 1,400 square feet (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5 1986:2709.11(21)).

After working on it for several years, on August 16, 1988, the Forest Service adopted the revised recreation residence policy, which was published in the Federal Register (53 FR 30924-30941). However, the policy was appealed to the Department of Agriculture; and, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture upheld the appeal for several sections, including provisions for future use determinations and permit renewals. So, in 1989, the Forest Service issued notice in the Federal Register converting the 1988 policy to interim guidance, and withdrawing the sections upheld under appeal for further revision (54 FR 38700). On June 2, 1994, the second revision of the recreation residence policy was finalized (59 FR 28714-28741). It was interesting to note, that a total of 7,793 responses was received on the draft policy; of those, 60% was from permittees, 12% was from friends or family of permittees, 1% from permittee associations, and 26% from other interested parties. More than 50% of the comments came from California (59 FR 28714). The policy states:

> Recreation residences are a valid use of National Forest System lands. They are an important component of the overall National Forest recreation program and have the potential of supporting a large number of recreation person-days. They may provide special recreation experiences that might not otherwise be available. It is Forest Service policy to continue recreation residence use and to work in partnership with holders of these permits to maximize the recreational benefits of these residences (59 FR 28727; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1994a:2347.1)

Decisions about recreation use are now tied to consistency with Forest Plans (59 FR 28731-28732; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1994a:2347.03(2)). Where continued recreation residence use is determined to be inconsistent with Forest Plan allocations, a process is described in the Special Uses Administration section of the Forest Service Manual to eventually terminate permits, which, under normal circumstances, takes ten years (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1994b:2721.23e(2)). All in all, many studies have been undertaken, but few actual decisions to terminate permits and remove recreation residences have been made. The number of recreation residences has decreased by more than 25% since the late 1960s; but most losses have been accounted for by land exchanges into private ownership and losses from natural disasters, such as fire or flood, rather than by recapture. Recreation residences remain a viable and active, albeit sometimes controversial, part of the Forest Service recreation program.

As time went on, Forest Service guidelines for recreation residences became more and more specific. Earlier guidance was very general, with periodic references to blending with the surrounding environment. However, the requirement that recreation residence plans be approved by the Forest Service was an early, and continuing, guideline that essentially ensured development of a rustic architectural style, harmonizing with the environment. That was the Forest Service environmental and administrative ethic then

(after all, those early Forest Rangers were living in log cabins, hiking and riding horses through the woods); it still is the recreation residence management ethic, even with the much more complex guidelines today. Later specificity was essentially a response to public pushing of the guidance envelope, an effort to limit development and maintain the rustic character of the environment.

During the early 1990s, while the current policy was still being revised, a national review of the recreation residence program was undertaken, essentially generated by management concerns on the National Forests in southern California. The review documented numerous problems in administration of special use permits, particularly full-time occupancy, unauthorized improvements, and inconsistent policies and guidelines. The review made a specific recommendation, amongst others, that regional recreation residence standards and guidelines be updated and further developed, to achieve consistency of administration (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office, Lands 1993:1-4).

Thus, recreation residence guidelines for special use permits are again being revised by Region 5. Part of this revision is a historic evaluation strategy. The guideline revision and historic strategy have roots in earlier work done in the region: the recreation residence historic thematic study, completed by the region in 1990 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region 1990), and recreation residence guidelines completed on the Eldorado National Forest in 1996 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest 1996).

The regional revision is leading the way for national recreation residence guideline revisions. Regardless of their numerous revisions, though, the guidelines have been and continue to be designed to ensure health and safety, and to harmonize developments with the rustic environment. All in all, they have provided a unifying force that has resulted in a rustic historic character readily identifiable with Forest Service management.

CHAPTER 4

THE HOMEBUILDERS AND OWNERS

Introduction

The other major players in the development of recreation residences were, of course, the homebuilders and owners themselves. While they came from a variety of backgrounds, there are some generalizations, which can be made. One defining characteristic that these people held in common was an appreciation of outdoor living and the rural setting. As Helen Blasdale Guillou put it: "The stability of the first permittees is remarkable and is indicative of the personal values each placed on the privililige [sic] of living in such an environment" (Guillou 1976:4).

Permanent Residency of Homeowners

The length of time summer home permittees spent at their cabins for visits reveals some interesting patterns through time. Data from the Stanislaus National Forest show that in earlier years, the average length of stay was over 20 days. By the 1960s, the average visit had dwindled to 7 days. A corollary of this dynamic was that summer residences in several tracts became accessible and desirable throughout the year, such that rather than make one or two long visits, permittees came more often for shorter stays. Scores of factors figure into this pattern, among them the increasing ease of travel, growth of winter sports, and the increase of wives working outside of the home (Conners 1993:7).

As this more year-round use became more prevalent, the term summer home gave way to recreation residence. Replacing an earlier pattern of residence permittees having their primary home in the foothills, by 1939, the vast majority of summer homes permitted on the Stanislaus was to permanent residents of the greater San Francisco Bay Area. In descending order, the urban areas represented were: the Bay Area cities totaling 328 permittees; central San Joaquin Valley cities such as Stockton and Modesto, second with 154; permittees from Central Sierra foothills towns like Sonora and Angeles Camp, third with 58 (Stanislaus National Forest n.d.:1). The raw numbers underscore the observation made by Stanislaus officials in early 1940 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest 1940:5):

> Whereas early [recreational] visitors were almost exclusively from nearby mining and agricultural communities, nowadays, the great majority of them come from the cities and large towns at much greater distances.

Family and Community Ties

In many ways, the rural, temporary communities they comprised were like neighborhoods in which people permanently lived. There were frequently strong communal relationships and activities. There were often close family or professional

ties; with homeowners assisting people they knew in obtaining lots or cabins being sold (Berg 1975:79; McIntyre n.d.:4-5). One early *Sunset Magazine* article, promoting the idea of summer homes states: "Families and friends are encouraged to rent series of sites forming summer colonies" (Singer 1917:36). The author describes how several members of her family each agreed to chip in to pay part of the annual rental fee, and they each planned their vacations in relays. Some homes have been owned by generations of the same family while others have passed through sale to numerous owners. Because of this, the residences and lots have, on the whole, undergone constant change (Conners 1993:1).

Families and neighbors often recreated together or engaged in joint efforts to improve an entire tract. Their summer home social circle took place in an environment that may have differed considerably from their day-to-day routine lives. Another *Sunset* article says: "The permittees on the group sometimes organize themselves into united community effort engaged in the development of the recreation possibilities of their particular unit" (Cecil 1917:71). Elmer Smith Murchie describes gatherings at this cabin on Huntington Lake on the Sierra: "Many groups of our friends were entertained there, Bridge clubs, Church groups, Company parties and just friends. A great place for outdoor singing with Lloyd Lynn and his accordian [sic], Sammy with his trumpet, and me with my mandolin!" (Murchie n.d.:15). The communal sharing of relaxing, simple, fun experiences, frequently created long-lasting bonds among homeowners, and strengthened these relationships.

Associations -- Early on, the Forest Service encouraged summer home permittees to organize into associations, a practice that would have far reaching consequences for recreation residence management and policy. The associations helped relieve Forest officers of recreation residence administrative burdens, particularly those related to tract improvement needs, such as road construction or water development. The associations worked closely, under agreements, with the Forest Service; and, the Forest Service often supplied goods or services needed to help complete association tasks (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest 1928; Berg 1975:138, 163-164). Provisions were made in early Forest Service guidelines and permits that required permittee conformance with association rules:

> Should there now exist, or subsequently be organized, a cooperative public service organization or association composed of the majority of the Special Use permittees located in this tract, the holder of this permit agrees to be subject to all rules and regulations of such association or organization (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District 1924:49).

The earliest documented recreation residence associations were from tracts in California. Berg (1975:176 (footnote 2)) noted that the earliest association had been traced to the Strawberry Flat recreation residence owners, at Lake Arrowhead, on the San Bernardino National Forest, organized in 1923 to secure a domestic water supply. However, Conners (1993:25) cited that even earlier, in 1922, the Lower Strawberry Lake tract owners, at Pinecrest on the Stanislaus National Forest, organized themselves into an association (popularly known as the Old Association) to secure a domestic water supply.

Many were established when a group of homeowners wished to obtain permission for some joint effort. In one example, a group of homeowners in the Deadman's Flat Tract on the Stanislaus National Forest needed to construct a bridge across the middle fork of the Stanislaus River to bring in building supplies. They applied for approval to the Forest Service office, then in San Francisco, and were told that they would first need to organize an association with a constitution and by laws (McIntyre n.d.:5-6). They established the Deadman's Flat Improvement Association, and the bridge was built using the association's membership fees. There were a variety of efforts on which homeowners collaborated. Supernowicz and McNiel (1997:29) cited an early association formed in 1923 at Big Santa Anita Canyon to hire a patrolman to guard against vandalism. Another study, notes that the American River Summer Home Owner's Association was formed early in 1924 to protect summer homes, increase fire protection, improve sanitation, and improve roads and trails along the South Fork of the American River, on the Eldorado National Forest (Supernowicz and McNiel 1992:36).

In later years, the associations at Pinecrest on the Stanislaus National Forest were influential in organizing the National Forest Permittees Association and setting recreation residence policy. In fact, they are thought to be the roots of the later, nation-wide recreation residence owner's association, the National Forest Permittees Association (a subdivision of the National Forest Recreation Association, organized in 1948). This national organization became a strong voice in setting recreation residence policy after World War II (Conners 1993:25).

Demographics

Economic Status - The second home phenomenon has been characterized as "largely filtered down from the elite to the middle class". It has been viewed as an extension of the practice of "resorting", and as part of the late 19th and early 20th century Back-to-Nature Movement (Berg 1975:1-2, 68-70). This movement was largely instigated, nurtured, and sustained by those with the income and the opportunity to avail themselves of spending leisure time away from their urban homes in rustic resort accommodations (Berg:1975:2). Although in general there is some truth to this, there were other antecedents for second homes, particularly those in the mountains, where second homes were not an elitist endeavor. Supernowicz and Richford, for example, pointed out that in the latter half of the 19th century, the practice of establishing summer homes probably evolved from local ranchers and farmers taking their families to the mountains after harvest, while others built summer cabins as part of dairy or grazing operations (Supernowicz and Richford 1987:1; Ayres and Hutchinson 1927:15).

In one example according to Helen Blasdale Guillou, the Emerald Bay Tract in the Lake Tahoe area consisted of a section of 15 lots opened in 1927 and owned by professionals. A second section of 9 lots was built in the early 1930s by tradesmen or "artisans", several of whom were employed in the area and lived in their homes fulltime despite the prohibition regarding long-term occupancy (Guillou 1976:3-4). This lower section has yielded some interesting tales of recreation residence builders and owners recorded by her (Guillou 1976). Nevertheless, in general, the first summer homeowners can be said to have come from middle class families, living in metropolitan areas of the state, and

with leisure time to spend in summer recreation pursuits (Berg 1975:78-79). Educators comprised one of the largest groups of summer homeowners. Teachers from many of the state's largest universities recognized the benefits of outdoor living, and obtained permits for summer homes. For example, Guillou (1976) gives an account of several homeowners, who worked at or were retired from positions at the University of California in Berkeley and San Francisco.

Ethnic Background - Berg points out that recreation residence owners have been almost exclusively Caucasian, and that the origins of the idea of owning summer homes might have been Scandinavian (Berg 1975:79). It might, therefore, be expected that many structures would follow forms and exhibit features evolved from northern European building types. As inventories are compiled describing recreation residence building types, it will be interesting to see whether this holds true. The National Trust for Historic Preservation publication, *America's Architectural Roots,* explores the ethnic origins of building types (Upton 1986). Certainly, American vernacular architecture reflects an amalgam of cultural influences, and that amalgam would be reflected in recreation residence architecture.

Gender - During the latter half of the 19th century, and the beginning of the 20th century, women sought new rights, and expansion of their role in the work place, and a release from the confinement of their traditional domestic positions. In 1893, a popular women's magazine from southern California comments (Orcutt 1893:1):

> Women's sphere in the last century has broadened greatly in what we are pleased to call civilized countries. She is no longer restricted to social and household duties, but is permitted to seek recreation or profit in any channel that is proper for man to engage in.

Women sought outdoor activities with the same vigor men did. Many advocated conservation of the nation's natural resources and, were active in such organizations as the Sierra Club.

Analyzing lists of early summer home permittees on the Stanislaus National Forest, it is apparent that women were represented to a perhaps surprising level. Over all 15% of the original permits were solely in women's names, while 42% were solely in men's names. The remainder was in the names of couples, multiple families, or in names that could not be identified by gender. For the primary childcare providers, a recreation residence in the mountains, near the safety of other permittees, and usually close to Forest Service administrative outposts, was undoubtedly an attractive concept. Here, their children could have the advantage of a protected outdoor experience throughout the summer (Conners 1993:8-9 and Appendix 1).

Magazines targeted primarily to the female audience enthusiastically promoted summer homes on national forests. *Sunset* (1917) started early with a set of articles entitled, *Vacations Made East: How Uncle Sam Invites the Family Out to His Place in the Country*, in its August 1917 issue, which would have been particularly appealing to

women. In one of the articles, A Shop-Girl's Summer Home, Caroline Singer wrote: "Even Mom has had a hand in the building". And W.D. Young (1917) wrote Summer Homes for Everybody and included several photographs of women recreation in the article. The *Saturday Evening Post* published an article by Thoda Cocroft, called "Summer-Home Sites in the National Forests (Cocroft 1930). The July 1946 issue of *House Beautiful*, contained an article by Helen W. Brown entitled: "A Kingdom for a Song", which told readers " how you can lease...government land on which to build your 'escape' house" (Brown 1946). As late as April 1960, *Good Housekeeping* included an article titled: "Yes, a Summer Home in a National Forest" (Author unknown 1960:172; Berg 1975:references; Conners 1993:8).

CHAPTER 5

RECREATION RESIDENCE TRACTS AS RURAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPES AND EXAMPLES OF RUSTIC VERNACULAR ARCHITECTURE

Recreation residence tracts on National Forests are best described as rural historic communities on public land, focused on outdoor recreation. While they were usually laid out according to a plan guided by the Forest Service, their spatial organization depended, in large part, on predominant landforms and natural features, and orientation to views and microclimates in an area. Tracts were comprised of standard elements: circulation networks, including roads, trails, and footpaths, sometimes located in relation to major routes or highways; water systems; natural and exotic vegetation; open spaces; the residences themselves and their related outbuildings; and a variety of smaller-scale elements, such as fire pits, rock retaining walls, and benches. The buildings are best described as rustic, vernacular architecture. They are generally small in size, constructed largely of native materials, with strong ties to their setting, and built by ordinary people.

John Coggeshall and Jo Anne Nast in their book *Vernacular Architecture* maintain that:

> Culture provides a framework, a mental pattern; individuals modify their environment to fit that pattern as closely as possible. This transformation includes a diversity of alternatives: perceptions of proper living and work environments; adjustments for climate and topography; proximity to neighbors or livestock; conceptions of appropriate building materials and technology; as well as a desire to continue traditions and patterns from earlier generations (Coggeshall and Nast 1988:8-9).

They also acknowledge that popular national or regional styles influence architectural patterns, and that buildings are physical manifestations of culture. How did the cultural perceptions of the day transform the environment when applied to recreation residences?

The Rural Historic Landscape

The National Register defines a rural historic landscape as:

> ...a geographical area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy or intervention, and that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features. (McClelland, *et al.* 1999:1-2.

One of the major land uses included in this property type is recreation; so, certainly recreation residence tracts fall within this definition. But more than simply the result of human activity, recreation residence tracts, as rural landscapes, are a convergence of both

cultural and natural forces. They reflect the beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and values of the people who built them, and adaptation to the natural features of an area. Recreation residence tracts are not some static ideal, but a balance between the forces of stability and of change brought about by both humans and the environment.

The Role of Agency Planning - During the early years of recreation on public lands(1900-1915), forests and parks, alike, experienced uneven and poorly coordinated development of facilities, even though many improvements, such as hotels and other tourist facilities, were built. In the process, little was done to protect scenic views or blend buildings with their environment. In Forest Service management of recreation residences, there was no consistency of building styles or guidance at the national level (Tweed 1980:3). But as we have seen in Chapter 3, this soon changed and forest guidance became more and more explicit.

As early as 1918, a "Statement of Policy" showed the newly established National Park Service administration's devotion to harmonizing improvements with the landscape, preservation of scenery, and comprehensive planning (Tweed, *et al.* 1977:23; U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1918:274). Undoubtedly, the Forest Service was closely watching its competitor as it developed and administered policies.

Frank A. Waugh, a consultant probably hired to demonstrate Forest Service commitment to recreation (Tweed 1980:6), looked at design needs for recreation residence tracts. He established goals, similar to those of parks, of preserving natural features and harmonizing with the landscape. In his writings, he talked about not laying out rows of summer home lots in stiff, unnatural, straight lines, but instead, following a stream or lakeshore at a distance. He discussed the need to conform to the slope of the topography and to consider features on the land. He suggested that spatial organization was important to the character of a tract--lots should not be over crowded and layout should provide for open spaces. At one point he says:

> One of the most serious and fundamental proposes of recreation in the Forest is to escape from...city crowding and to give each person the feeling that for once he has room to expand. (Waugh 1918a:9).

He goes on to say that, "...the wild character is to be preserved as far as possible" (Waugh 1918a:16). But he also contends that rigidly following these principles would not ensure a pleasing design, and that artistic ability was required.

Waugh's writings clearly demonstrate a keen respect for the environment and the natural setting, and take into consideration the needs of the homeowners and the general public recreating in a rural environment--all values that are rooted in the cultural framework of the first few decades of the 20th century. Not all recreation residences tracts on all forests followed these landscape design principles; local forest administrators would have had varying abilities and training in landscape architecture. The Forest Service's decision not to invest in landscape architectural expertise, and instead to give this work to foresters, also probably influenced tract layout. But many tracts where Waugh's principles were

successfully applied would have been important physical manifestations of the aesthetic values of the time. Certainly, Waugh is specifically cited in the Forest Service's manuals of 1924 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District:7-14) and 1946 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region:30-31).

When a tract was planned, a survey map and report were usually prepared. The report was fairly detailed and included information similar to today's environmental impact statements, such as climate, vegetation, water supply cost considerations and methods used to survey the lots. They also might include recommendations on how to incorporate other public uses. Unfortunately, few of these early reports are still extant (Berg 1975:92-94).

Rustic Vernacular Architecture

Sometimes larger landscape features--major roads, streams, and so on--or administrative planning efforts, where several tracts were laid out in concert, provided a unifying context for multiple tracts. The tract--its subdivision of lots and interconnecting roads and trails, communal areas, and natural features--topography and vegetation--provided a context for the lots. Then, the lot and its associated features provided a context for the residence. A building provided a context for it's many parts, the doors, windows, and construction materials. Because the residences themselves were an important component of this hierarchy--the focal point of the homeowner's activities, the individual's source of pride of ownership--it is important to identify the influences on their physical appearance.

Recreation residences have been identified as rustic, vernacular architecture by many sources (Carr and McNiel 1999; Palmer and Cole1998; Dodd 1995; Conners 1993; Supernowicz and McNiel 1992). Rustic architecture has been defined:

> Successfully handled, [rustic] is a style which, through the use of native materials in proper scale, and through the avoidance of rigid, straight lines, and over-sophistication, gives the feeling of having been executed by pioneer craftsmen with limited hand tools. It thus achieves sympathy with natural surroundings and with the past." (Tweed, *et al.* 1977:93).

The term vernacular suggests that something was designed by a craftsman or perhaps an owner, but not by a professional architect, and again, was built with local material. National Register Bulletin 31 defines vernacular architecture:

> ...this type can be idiosyncratic amalgams of building traditions and styles, strongly reflecting the personality of the builder, or they may represent the more potent cultural dynamic of time and place. A key feature of vernacular buildings is their affinity for and adaptation to landscape, climate, and cultural patterns. Architectural "style" is insignificant in comparison to the form of the building, its construction materials, and the layout of the rooms (Wyatt 1987:4).

However, this term has been used more broadly and material sources such as ready-cut and prefabricated are vernacular as well. "It embraces a definition inclusive of...mass produced building forms" (*Ibid.*). Largely derived from antiquarians of the mid-19th century interested in rural life, vernacular also implies modification and change (Jackson 1984:85). Thus, this architectural genre is a logical outgrowth of the ideals and values of the Back-to-Nature and Conservation Movements. Rustic architecture was popular from roughly the mid-1800s to the mid-1900s, and the later half of that time spans the vernacular construction of most recreation residences.

The basic precepts of rustic architecture had their origins in earlier works by Andrew Jackson Downing (1815-1852), who published his ideas in the mid 1800s; in turn-of-the-20th-century works by Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903); in San Francisco Bay Area architects, such as Bernard Maybeck (1882-1957); and in the eclectic architects working for concessionaires and railroad companies in the tourist industry (Tweed *et al.*:1977 3-11). The Back-to-Nature Movement and the concept that humans, in general, and buildings, in particular, had unique relationships with their natural settings influenced these early pioneers. Their buildings were constructed of natural materials and integrated with their natural settings.

The Adirondack Style (1870-1930) of rustic building was an important outgrowth of this architectural philosophy. William West Durant, an architect who designed rustic estates for the wealthy in rural upstate New York, is credited with being its originator. Durant was schooled in Europe and incorporated features of Swiss Chalets into his designs. His style, which relied heavily on the use of native building materials, was well established in the Northeast by the late 19th century, and quickly spread west (Masterpiece Productions 1998:3). Ana Koval, in her study of buildings in the Lake Tahoe area, concludes that while most of the rustic resort buildings were not of the same grand scale as the great lodges in the Adirondacks, that the Adirondack Style was clearly influential (Koval 1990:51).

Other sources encouraged the amateur to consider building a rustic vacation home. Kemp's book of 1908 promoted the simple one to one-and-one-half story cabin, stained to take on the color of the surroundings--he called it "chameleon-like"--whose "success will be measured not by its size, but by its comfort." He placed considerable value on a building's compatibility with its environment, and the plans he provided in one chapter were simple to build. He suggested that the reader write to the United States Department of Agriculture, through its Forestry Bureau, for pamphlets on constructing a home in the woods (Kemp 1908:85).

The National Park Service championed rustic architecture in its tourist facilities. The first well-developed examples of park rustic architecture were erected in the 1920s (Tweed, *et al.* 1977:31). These buildings were of modern construction materials, but, where most visible, materials were natural, native wood and stone. The relationship between a building and its natural setting was clearly established for most of these buildings (*Ibid.*: 27-47). During this time, another important concept emerged, the idea that buildings harmonize with and reinforce a region's local cultural traditions (*Ibid.*:35).

And so during the next two decades, rustic architecture, designed to blend with its natural and cultural surroundings, was almost universally accepted as appropriate to National Parks. The Park Service hired several landscape architects and architects who worked together to implement these design concepts.

These concepts were formalized in a publication by Albert H. Good (1935) of the California State Park Division, *Park Structures and Facilities*, near the end of the rustic architecture movement. The use of these concepts and the rustic style fell out of favor in the decades following the major building effort by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s. This was due to several factors, including: a significant increase in work load toward the latter part of the CCC building era; an inability to individually train a rapidly growing staff; an influx of young professionals trained in more modern architectural philosophies, including the International Style, which emphasized simple, structural honesty, and efficiency; the labor intensive nature of building in the rustic style, and its high maintenance costs; and, quite simply, changing tastes. The new rustic style, however, did continue some of the same concepts, but those concepts were redefined. Buildings were still to blend with their environment and should use native materials, but this was to be achieved "through modest functional design". There was less emphasis on custom, hand detailing, and more emphasis on using standard hardware and materials that were simple yet efficient (Tweed, *et al.* 1977: 96, 104).

The Forest Service's commitment to a rustic style of architecture suited its own populist philosophy regarding construction of recreation facilities during its early years. However, there was a fear on the part of many in the Forest Service that the growth of recreation on national forests would result in over-development (Rothman 1997:118). The Park Service was accused of over development, and the Forest Service generally fought this trend. This philosophy was intimately tied to the idea that forests' primary proposes were timber and watershed management, and recreation was incidental. Construction was always envisioned at the lowest level possible. Recreation facilities were always recommended to be inexpensive and simple (Tweed 1980:16).

While there were many variations, and individual buildings were quite different, there were common characteristics of rustic architecture (Tweed *et al.* 1977: 93-94).

- Buildings were constructed of natural, native materials and textures, such as stone, log, or wood shingles.
- Natural colors were used to blend with the environment.
- Architectural elements were chosen for their utility, but also their ability to blend with the geology or terrain.
- The proportions of a building were designed to fit the site and its surroundings.
- Straight, harsh lines were avoided.

- Vertical emphasis was to be avoided, particularly in the form of large imposing roofs.

- Buildings were often designed to be viewed from all sides.

- A central, architectural theme was established for groups of buildings, or buildings within a park, to create continuity. Where early buildings existed, these themes were to blend and not contrast sharply.

- Buildings might incorporate historical or specific cultural details.

Popular Architectural Trends

While the general guiding ideals for the appearance of recreation residences were derived from the rustic tradition, a mix of other influences played a role. Unlike earlier Victorian architecture (1860-1900), American architecture of the first several decades of the 20th century was eclectic and often blended styles.

Eclectic Houses –The Eclectic Movement (1880-1940) in architecture drew on a wide range of styles and building material, many of which also made their way into the modest architecture of summer homes. For example, according to Ana Koval, this movement, perhaps more than any architectural trend, best reflects the varied styles found in post-1900 rustic architecture in the Sierra Nevada of California, in particular the Lake Tahoe area. Five building styles predominate in the lake basin area: English Cottage Revival; English Country Revival; Tudor Revival; and Craftsman bungalow, each meant to conjure up the romantic past and exotic locales (Koval 1990:53).

Craftsman Bungalow – Of the Eclectic architectural trends, Craftsman (1905-1930), the first phase of the Arts and Crafts Movement in America (McAlester and McAlester 1988:10), played a prominent role in California's mountain communities. The architects Charles Sumner Greene and Henry Mather Greene, working in Pasadena from 1893 to 1914, established Craftsman architecture as an important trend in the state (*Ibid.* 1988: 454). The term bungalow is of Eastern derivation and was used in India to describe temporary structures for travelers. It made its way into American usage, from about 1880 to the 1930s, to describe simple, informal, unpretentious dwellings (Lancaster 1986: 79-81). In California, the bungalow synthesized elements of the Craftsman movement as well as the Stick Style and even Japanese architectural elements.

A typical Craftsman bungalow was one or one-and-one-half stories with a low-pitched, overhanging, gabled or hipped roof with exposed rafter ends. The front porch either projected from the building with a gabled roof of its own, or was recessed into the mass of the building. Porch posts were "elephantine", usually on piers. Chimneys were typically cobblestone or brick. Small rectangular windows of wood sash or casement usually flanked exterior end chimneys. The exterior may have been wooden shingles, stone, stucco, concrete block, or brick (Koval 1990:55; McAlester and McAlester 1984:

453-463). When stucco was used for siding, the roof was generally of tile (Poppeliers *et al.* 1983:76), elements typical of the Spanish bungalow.

Elements of Craftsman architecture and the bungalow concept worked their way into the leisure-based architecture of summer homes through consumption-oriented marketing. Household magazines such as *House Beautiful, Good Housekeeping, Country Life in America, Ladies Home Journal*, and *Sunset* published home plans and designs in this style (McAlester and McAlester 1984:12). Entrepreneurs like Jud Yoho, who began the Craftsman Bungalow Company in 1911, marketed plans with specifications for customers of modest means (Ore 1997:233). And then, building companies supplied the burgeoning market of second homebuilders with the materials. Among the more notable firms were Mastercraft Cabin Company of San Jose, California; California Redwood Association, sponsors and advertisers of second homes built with redwood products; the Aladdin Company, makers of ready-cut homes in Michigan, Oregon, and Canada; and the Diamond Match Company of Chico, California. Sears, Roebuck provided several models in its catalogs and provided the materials for local builders (Poppeliers, *et al.* 1983:76-77).
Companies, such as the Shevlin Pine Sales Company offered both "Shevlin pine log siding" as well as designs for second homes using their half-log siding. And there were many more companies that advertised inexpensive versions of second homes (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region 1990, Summer Home Plans: Non-Agency, not paginated).

Building Types Based on Physical Form and Stylistic Detail

As described above, recreation residences on California's National Forests were meant to embody, in both design and material, a feeling of rusticity and compatibility with the environment in which they were built, and most fit within the broad genre of vernacular architecture. Most also drew on the Eclectic mix of architectural styles of the early 20th century. Within this general architectural context, vernacular properties have been classified in a variety of ways. Allan G. Noble, in *Wood, Brick, and Stone: The North American Settlement Landscape*, described a classification system based on exterior shape; some of those shape are represented in the rustic mountain recreation residences in California (Noble 1984). Virginia and Lee McAlester, in *A Field Guide to American Houses*, used three or four important identifying features as well as common shapes to classify vernacular architecture. Variations and similarities in large-scale features, such as roof form and facade balance, as well as smaller details, such as windows, doors, and porches, were considered. This classification system is most applicable to styled houses built before 1940, the period when most recreation residences in California were built (McAlester and McAlester 1988).

The following are the most common types, based on elevations, found in a cross section of recreation residences from north to south in California (Supernowicz and McNiel 1992:42-46 and McNiel 1994:21-24). There is little direct evidence that the use of these forms stems from long-evolved cultural patterns described in Noble or McAlester--they are part of an eclectic encyclopedia of forms and types that people used--but they are

useful descriptors and demonstrate the commonalities in recreation residence architecture.

Side-gable houses - The side-gable house includes folk house types such as the hall and parlor, the I-house, the Quebec cottage, and variants of the common Craftsman bungalow houses of the 20th century.

The **hall and parlor** type was named for its two ground floor rooms, the parlor and the somewhat larger hall. The parlor serves as a bedroom, guest chamber and formal reception room, while the hall functions as a kitchen, dining room, work area, and informal space. A garret or loft is common, accessed by a corner stairway and sometimes an exterior doorway. Modifications include the location of chimneys, porch size and shape, additions on the backside to increase space, a central passageway to increase privacy, or dormers to add light and headroom. The often-asymmetrical facade has offset entries and unevenly spaced windows (Noble 1984:49-51; McAlester and McAlester 1988:94-95).

The hall and parlor house may be the most common form found among recreation residences in California. Its simplicity, combined with its utility as a formal and informal living area, is credited with its widespread popularity.

Popular throughout the 19th century and into the 20th century, the **I-house**, with its side-facing gables, one-room depth, at least two-room width, and two stories, possessed a variety of facades and fit well in rural landscapes. Introduced into America by the English, the I-house quickly gained popularity along the Eastern Seaboard and later by settlers in the Far West. Designed with a central hallway and two rooms of equal size, the I-house could provide privacy, or an open floor plan depending, upon the occupant's needs (Noble 1984:52-55; McAlester and McAlester 1988: 96-97).

Recreation residences, which utilize the I-house form, are predominately single-story or one-and-one-half stories; typical, full, two-story I houses are rare; thus, this style's layout was used, but its height was not. The majority was one-room deep with a side-gable, and had a loft for storage or additional sleeping quarters. Lower elevation residences tended to include full porches, while higher elevation residences adapted a wide unenclosed deck. Fireplaces were built on either gable end, but rarely as a central hearth. Cladding included shingles, shakes, boards and battens, V-groove pine, and even logs.

One of the best examples of the **continuous roof house** type is the **grenier folk house**, popularized by Acadian settlers in Louisiana. The design of the grenier house is similar to the Quebec cottage, perhaps as a result of its roots in French Colonial house design. "Grenier" refers to the oversized loft, which projects out, over the open, front porch or veranda. Originally used as sleeping quarters for the bachelor members of the family, the loft functions today as additional storage. Defined by wooden pillars, the porch spreads the entire length of the home, providing shade and shelter from hot or cold weather (Noble 1984:89-90; McAlester and McAlester 1988:126-27).

The grenier design is common in high elevation recreation residence tracts. A number of good examples can be found at Kirkwood and Silver Lakes Recreation Residence Tracts on the Eldorado National Forest.

Evoking the feeling of a cottage, the **Quebec house** type was originally built in and around Quebec City, Canada. Designed for cold climates, the Quebec cottage was characterized by a steeply pitched roof, extended bell-cast eaves up to forty inches, and a full porch, sometimes raised above ground level. The interior plan generally consisted of two rooms of unequal size; the larger deemed the winter room, and the smaller the summer room. The summer room generally had a large stone hearth used for cooking. A narrow stairway led to the loft. Chimneys were placed inside the wall on each gable end. Quebec cottages were built of both wood and stone (Noble 1984:13-14). McAlester classifies these house types as the French Colonial tradition (McAlester and McAlester 1988:125).

While the bell-cast eaves are unique, many of the Quebec cottage's other attributes are found in recreation residences. The steeply pitched roof, the eve overhang, the loft, the use of the hearth for cooking, and the front porch can be found in many recreation residences.

Gable-front - The front-gabled house most commonly used was referred to in folk architecture as the **shotgun house**. This type was derived from structures built in Africa and introduced into Haiti and later southern Louisiana during the mid-19th century. The shotgun house is unique because of its narrow, front-facing gable entrance with rooms aligned from front to rear.

Folk tradition suggests that "shotgun" refers to a shotgun blast, which if fired in the front door, would exit the rear door. Later examples have off center doors and corner porches, rather than the full front porch. The shotgun house was easily added to, by extensions from the gable ends. Shotgun houses were inexpensive to build and could be erected in a short period of time. By the 20th century, the shotgun style became a common form of industrial or company housing in large metropolitan areas. In resorts and tourist camps the shotgun house was popular as a rental cottage or single-family dwelling (Noble 1984:95-97; McAlester and McAlester 1988:90). A **camelback house** is a modification of the shotgun house, either one or two rooms wide, with a two-story section at the rear to provide more space and extended views (Noble 1984:98).

During the 20th century the gable-front house type was incorporated into the traditional **bungalow** design and varieties of Craftsman homes. It was commonly used in recreation residence tracts, particularly on small, narrow lots. After 1920, recreation residence owners frequently adopted camelbacks designsto accommodate more living space. Camelback designs also reflect later additions, as extended space was needed and, since full 2 story houses were generally not approved, the half story on the back may have been more acceptable to the Forest Service.

Pyramid roof house - Derived from the French and popularized in the South, by the 20th century the pyramidal roof design had spread throughout North America. Basically a square plan, the interior consists of four equal-sized rooms or two rooms on either side of a central hallway. Most pyramid roofs are steep, without coming to a point at the peak. Dormers were often added along with an upstairs attic space converted to rooms. Full porches were most common, with symmetrical door and window arrangements (Noble 1984:99-100; McAlester and McAlester 1988:27, 55).

For recreation residences two distinct styles of pyramid roof homes have been identified, the wide or extended pyramid, and the narrow or steep pyramid. Chosen for high elevations, the steep pyramid shed both rain and snow adequately, while the roof might be widened in areas of average precipitation.

A-frame - The A-frame, an example of more contemporary folk tradition, is characterized by a steep, extended roof almost reaching the ground. Popularized after World War II, the A-frame developed as a summer or second home and later was adapted to residential construction, particularly in mountainous communities. The steep, extended roof allowed for a more spacious floor plan, but also a more awkward one, with its inward sloping walls. Usually included in most A-frames were a loft and a wood stove, rather than a rock chimney. Two variants have been identified; the full extended A-frame and the modified, half A-frame. A-frames were designed for areas of heavy of snow, while large decks were added to take advantage of the warm summer days and views. (McAlester and McAlester1988:496-497).

Log tradition

The log tradition falls outside of the other major architectural trends, but exhibits the essential rustic vernacular framework. In North America, log construction has been primarily attributed to the Swedes, Finns, and Germans, with the German influence being the most widespread. In early log construction, the timbers were generally acquired locally. Logs were often left round, but were also hewn and stripped of their bark. Various studies have shown that ethnic groups used distinctive corner-notching styles. Builders used a variety of chinking materials, including mud, clay, wood, straw, and stones.

Log construction is a building technique found on many of the earlier recreation residences; however, it only represents a small percent of the sample thus far recorded. Homes in the Sierra Nevada sometimes used logs as the principal siding, with other manufactured sidings, such as rustic V-groove in pine or fir, for trim and the upper gable walls. During the 1920s and 30s, many recreation residences adapted the log tradition look to wood frame structures by using pre-manufactured half-log siding. Logs were perhaps most commonly used for porches and railings and decorative frameworks for retaining walls and trellises. Log construction as a principal building material today has once again emerged as an efficient and affordable means of home building.

Noble describes four principal log home variants: the basic **square log cabin**, characterized by its square floor plan, one and one-half stories with loft joists projecting below the wall plate, interior gable chimney, lack of a rear door, a front door on the side of the house, and shed-roofed additions (Noble 1984:114); the **saddlebag house** with a room added to the chimney gable of the original structure (Noble 1984:115); the **double pen** with the addition on the gable end away from the chimney (Noble 1984:117), and the **dog trot** house with the addition of a second pen with an open space between, all of which are covered by the gable roof house type (Noble 1984:117-118). McAlester, uses the same types but classifies log homes as either Pre-Railroad (McAlester and McAlester 1988:75, Continental log house (McAlester and McAlester 1988:82), or Midland tradition (McAlester and McAlester 1988:75).

Individual Expression and Unique characteristics

A myriad of cultural values and architectural trends influenced the building of summer homes. And while they generally fall into the rubric of rustic vernacular, they also reflect the individuals who built them and the families who have lived in them and modified them over the decades. Many of the early permittees designed and built their own cabins, or at least directed their construction. Thus, summer home cabin construction also exhibited unconventional design and materials. Some homeowners were carpenters and constructed well-built cabins, while others lacked skill (Guillou 1976:4). For example, the centerpiece of many cabins was the fireplace, often built of massive rocks, acquired on site or locally, and in some cases, entire tracts used skilled masons for fireplace construction. On the other hand, a 1949 special use memorandum states that, "collapse of most structures was due to lack of diagonal wall bracing, inadequate foundations, lack of trussing joists and rafters, and skimping on nails or bolts" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest 1949). Some residences were built almost overnight, while others took years or were never finished, despite the two-year limit on construction.

Many cabins were built to take advantage of panoramic views of lakes and rivers; others were designed for densely forested areas with only a restricted view. Local climate and natural features played a role in the creation of each tract. Recreation residences built at elevations above 5,000 feet were required to meet certain specifications in order to withstand heavy snow, such as the use of stronger materials or a steep pitch to the roof. Obstacles such as massive rock outcrops, steep slopes, and poor access called for creativity and adaptability. Each site had its own character and the tract had its own unique adaptation to that environment. Lumber and materials were often purchased from local manufacturers, whereas fixtures and appliances were brought in from all parts of the state. Thus, recreation residences also reflect individualism, emanating from the personality of the builder, the character of the local environment, and the availability of building materials.

CHAPTER 6

RECREATION RESIDENCE HISTORY IN REGION 5

The majority of Forest Service recreation residence development took place in California. As documented in Chapter 3, some key administrative issues first arose, or were resolved, based on summer home development in Region 5. The following chapter traces the history of recreation residence permits and tracts on the National Forests in California.

The Early Years and Rapid Development

The earliest documented recreation residence permits in Region 5 were Organic Act terminable permits issued on the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve (now the Angeles National Forest) and the Sierra Forest Reserve (now the Sierra National Forest), in 1906. The first summer home permit issued on the Angeles was for 50 acres, in San Gabriel Canyon, above Azuza, signed on August 13, 1906 (Berg 1975:70-73). The 1909 annual report for the National Forests in California, the earliest such report issued, documented 144 summer home special use permits (Barrett 1932:116). The San Bernardino issued terminable permits at Big Bear from 1911 to 1914 (Gallup 1989:20). These early permits preceded the planned development of recreation residence tracts.

Enactment of the Occupancy Permits Act of 1915 may not have affected the issuance of recreation residence permits much, since Organic Act terminable permits continued to be used for the majority of cases; but, it definitely spurred development of recreation residence tracts. The Forester's instructions related to the Occupancy Permits Act recommended that forest supervisors should, as early as practicable, survey recreation residence tracts where public demand was high (Graves 1915b:2). Region 5 obviously took this direction to heart; in 1915, 3 tracts were surveyed; in 1916, 12 were surveyed; in 1917, 14 (Berg 1975:91).

In 1916, when Frank A. Waugh, the consulting landscape engineer, completed his survey of recreation uses on the National Forests, he visited several tracts and calculated 6,150 recreation residence visitors in Region 5, more than half of all such permit visitors in the Forest Service at that time; visitors, he estimated, averaged 10 hours per visit (Waugh 1917:115, 120). Berg (1975:222) documents a total of 2,118 recreation residence permits issued by the Forest Service in 1916; thus, based on Waugh's visitor estimates, more than half of these permits was likely issued in California.

Further evidence of the region's early support for the recreation residence program is found in the 1916 State Forester's Sixth Biennial Report, where Region 5's District Forester, Coert DuBois, supplied an article extolling the virtues of summer homes on the National Forests. DuBois cited tracts staked out and large lots available, for annual rental fees of only $10 to $25, on the Cleveland, Angeles, Santa Barbara, Sierra, Mono, Stanislaus, Eldorado, Tahoe, Plumas, Shasta, and Trinity Forests. He noted that these were in desirable locations along streams and lakes. Some advantages he listed included

no taxes, no assessments for roads or trails, timber at cost or free for building, fuel wood easily gathered, and the surrounding forest forever free from spoliation. Restrictions he noted were that sewage was to be disposed of adequately, no unsightly structures were to disfigure the landscape, and the renter's building plans had to be approved by the forest supervisor (DuBois 1916). "For full measure the forest service will throw in plans for the construction of a simple summer home, with specifications for material and directions for building" (*Ibid.* 1916:49).

It appears that all of California's National Forests embraced the summer home concept, and some showed extraordinary zeal, probably proportional to the pressure they had been under to provide lots on public lands (Conners 1993:6). For example, it is estimated that the Inyo National Forest converted one-half of all its first class developable land to summer home lots (Berg 1975:6). As another example, early in its program, the Angeles surveyed one tract in a canyon with a newly built road intended for recreation access, and within six months, 226 of 250 platted summer home lots were under permit (Sherman 1916:294). By 1920, the Angeles administered 1,329 summer residence and commercial resort permits (Tweed 1980:3). Earlier, Edward Sherman, Assistant Forester for Lands in the Washington Office, noted that the Forest Service even provided an adequate supply of domestic water for developed recreation residence tracts at the newly built Huntington Reservoir on the Sierra National Forest (Sherman 1916:294).

Early Influences

With primitive road systems and slow travel in the early years, recreation residence tracts developed more quickly in locations accessible to large metropolitan areas. Thus, the Angeles and San Bernardino National Forests had the earliest significant development. Major tracts on the Angeles were developed between 1916 and 1926, and on the San Bernardino between 1915 and 1923. Most of the tracts on the Angeles were located within narrow canyons carved into the steep western escarpment of the San Gabriel and Sierra Pelona Mountains, just above the densely settled San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys. Recreation residence tracts on the San Bernardino were also convenient to the Inland Empire, but they were generally located on flats adjacent to reservoirs constructed in the early 1900s for irrigation and flood control purposes. The tract at Big Bear was first surveyed under the Occupancy Permits Act in 1915; but, at least 16 summer homes were already established there, following construction of the new dam in 1911 and prior to the 1915 tract survey (Berg 1975:23, 20, 23-31; Gallup 1989:13-14, 20).

The automobile was quick to catch on in California, and soon the State was investing in a substantial highway system. In the Sierran Forests, recreation residence tracts were developed along the main routes of this newly created highway system. The Lincoln Highway, the nation's first transcontinental highway (now Interstate 80 and U.S. 50), and California Highways 88, 4, and 108 provided access for tract development on the Eldorado and Stanislaus National Forests (Supernowicz and Richford 1987:15).

Some of the earlier tracts on the Eldorado National Forest lie along the old Lincoln Highway, U.S. 50, which runs along the south shore of Lake Tahoe, up over Echo

Summit, and down along the South Fork of the American River. One of the most popular locations for recreation residences was surrounding the shores of Lake Tahoe, and around other smaller lakes in its basin, particularly Fallen Leaf and Echo Lakes. Soon after tracts were opened here they filled. Early developments ranged from 1915 to the early 1920s. Development continued, especially along Highway 50, well into the 1930s. In later years, many of the tracts around Lake Tahoe were exchanged out of federal ownership (Berg 1975:34, 37-42). Today, the Eldorado has the largest number of recreation residences of any National Forest, even though several of its original tracts around Lake Tahoe moved to administration by the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, when it was created in 1978.

The Forest Service took advantage not only of early highways but also of early hydroelectric projects, and their many newly built reservoirs, to develop recreation residence tracts and other recreation facilities. The Pinecrest area in the Stanislaus National Forest, along California Highway 108, the Sonora Pass route, was one of the early Sierran recreation residence developments. There, the dam enlarging Strawberry Lake was completed by the Sierra and San Francisco Power Company in 1915, and by September 1916, the first 31 summer home lots of the Lower Strawberry Lake Tract were surveyed (Conners 1993:22).

Another of the earliest and most substantial developments was that around Huntington Lake and along its Big Creek drainage, a Southern California Edison hydropower project on the Sierra National Forest. Recreation residence tracts were built there initially in 1916, and continued through the 1910s. This was the development cited by Sherman in his 1916 report, noted above. By the 1930s, water and power became synonymous with recreation, and many mountain reservoirs had summer homes around them. Today, dozens of lakes and reservoirs in California, particularly in the Sierra middle elevations, include recreation residence tracts (Berg 1975:27, 32-34).

Early in the recreation residence program, the Forest Service encouraged organization of recreation residence permittees into associations, to help with administrative tasks. The earliest of these associations were documented in California, in the 1920s. (See Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of the influence of associations in California's National Forests.)

Thus, recreation residence tract development was well on its way in California's National Forests early in the program's history. World War I seemed not to significantly affect it, with several tracts surveyed each year of the war, right at the beginning of tract development. By 1920, 61 tracts had been developed. In 1922, Region 5's Forests had 3,881 out of 6,421 (60.4%) of the Forest Service permits issued nationally for recreation residences (Berg 1975:91, 222).

By the beginning of the 1930s, more than two-thirds of the total recreation residences and tracts had been established in Region 5. In 1931, the region had 6,755 out of 11,781 (57.3%) total permits issued, and 230 tracts developed. Even the early years of the depression saw active development of summer home tracts. In 1929, 12 new tracts and 3

additions were surveyed; in 1930, 12 new tracts and 5 additions; and in 1931, 9 new and 14 additions. Finally, in 1932, development started to slow, with only 3 new tracts and 7 additions (*Ibid.*). However, recreation residence development did continue, although at a slower pace. The 1934 regional financial statement reported that:

> ...summer homes were the only national forest resources that did not show a decline during the depression--one hundred and fifty had been added that year, and considerable building had been done (Supernowicz and Richford 1987:9).

The 1936 regional accomplishment report stated: "There are 8,000 permits for summer home sites and this number has been steadily increasing even during the past four years of business depression" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California National Forest Region 1936:4).

From a geographic viewpoint, by 1931, the urban Forests of southern California had the most permits; the Angeles had 1,814 recreation residences permitted, and the San Bernardino had 1,800. As a comparison, the next largest summer home developments in 1931 were on the Eldorado, with 856 permits, the Sierra with 413, and the Stanislaus with 386; these Forests were more distantly accessible to Central Valley communities and the Bay Area. Forests in the north, far distant from sizable communities, had few permits; the Modoc had 0, the Klamath 37, the Shasta 10, and the Trinity 17 (Berg 1975:56).

Slow Down with the New Deal

By the end of the 1930s, following the New Deal public conservation emphasis, recreation residence tract development slowed to a trickle, with only 1 tract addition in 1938, and 1 new tract and 1 addition in 1939 (*Ibid.*:91). The depression had finally caught up with the summer home phenomenon in California; and recreation was growing towards more general public uses.

Recreation residence development was virtually nonexistent during World War II, with only one new tract and two additions in 1941, none in 1942 and 1944, one addition in 1943, and one new tract and two additions in 1945 (*Ibid.*). Indeed, Forest Service recreation development of any kind essentially ceased during World War II (Tweed 1980:26). After the war, recreation residence development resumed in California, peaking in 1948, when 13 new tracts and 3 additions were completed. However, from then on it was generally maintained at a low level until the late 1950s (Berg 1975:91).

In the far northern Forests, such as the Modoc, Klamath, and Six Rivers, fewer tracts were selected, and many of these were developed after World War II. Summer home development on these Forests generally evolved slower than on the southern and central Forests; and the numbers were always small. The remoteness of the northern Forests to major population centers was one contributing factor to slower and smaller development. But, also, there was a lack of demand for such homes within the local area, as permanent residences in the small local communities were already close to forest recreation areas. Because of more restrictions placed on tract selection after the mid-1940s, these northern

recreation residence tracts also tended to be more isolated and farther from popular recreation areas. As a result, permittees here often chose to spend less money on their improvements than their predecessors had in the southern and central Forests in 1920s and 1930s. All in all, the costs of summer homes on the Forests in the northern part of the state may have outweighed the benefits for many potential permittees (Supernowicz and Richford 1987:15-16).

The 1955 directive requiring all new tracts to be approved at the Washington Office level essentially spelled the end of recreation residence tract development. The statistics bear this out; only five new tracts and four additions were developed in California from 1955 to 1959. The last documented tract developed in California was in 1959 (Berg 1975:91).

Even though the last recreation residence tracts were developed at the end of the 1950s, the individual lots were not all immediately occupied. Recreation residence permit issuances did not reach their zenith in the region until the 1960s. Berg cites the highest figures from 1968, when 9,060 recreation residences were permitted in Region 5 (*Ibid.*:153, 222). Since then, the numbers have declined. Numerous lots, and many entire tracts, were exchanged into private ownership, such as those at Lake Tahoe (*Ibid.*:153) and on the Six Rivers National Forest. Those at Mineral King were transferred to National Park Service administration, when portions of the Sequoia National Forest were added to Sequoia-Kings Canyon National Parks in 1978 (Carr and McNiel 1999:2). Entire tracts and numerous individual residences were lost to flooding, landslides, avalanches, fire, and other environmental disasters. The Forest Service recaptured some, but not many, citing higher public uses (Berg 1975:153-160).

Berg (*Ibid.*:152) used data from a 1965 recreation inventory and data he gathered in 1973 and 1974 to display the changes in recreation residence statistics. These data are compared to data from 2000 in Table 1. The overall trend is a decrease, of 25.9% over the 35-year period.

Table 1: Region 5 Recreation Residence Statistics, 1965, 1974, 2000

	# Recreation Residence Permits			%Change	# Tracts
Forest	**1965**	**1974**	**2000**	**1965-2000**	**2000**
Angeles	911	807	574	- 37.0	26
Cleveland	334	318	329	- 1.5	16
Eldorado	1,616	1,575	979	- 39.4	37
Inyo	510	456	351	- 31.2	25
Klamath	71	36	22	- 69.1	6
Lake Tahoe Basin*	0	0	597	+100.0	23
Lassen	475	406	400	- 15.8	9
Los Padres	214	212	161	- 24.8	7
Mendocino	103	112	112	+ 8.7	8
Modoc	9	7	5	- 44.4	3
Plumas	153	136	135	- 11.8	3

San Bernardino	1,790	1,118	778	- 56.5	24
Sequoia	400	380	250	- 37.5	16
Shasta-Trinity	150	180	163	+ 6.0	6
Sierra	639	571	558	- 12.7	23
Six Rivers	74	43	0	-100.0	0
Stanislaus	759	754	740	- 2.5	25
Tahoe	309	240	160	- 48.2	12
Region 5 Total:	**8,517**	**7,414**	**6,314**	**- 25.9**	**269**

* The Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit was created in 1978, out of lands from the Eldorado and Tahoe National Forests in the Pacific Southwest Region, and the Toiyabe National Forest in the Intermountain Region. Thus, some of the losses of recreation residence cabins from the Eldorado and Tahoe are added to the Lake Tahoe Basin between the 1974 and 2000 figures.

Today, the recreation residence program remains a viable, although controversial, part of the larger Forest Service recreation program. It is likely to remain so for years to come. No new tracts are foreseen to be added, although some existing ones may be moved to meet environmental, recreational, or other needs identified in Forest Plans. As opportunities arise, some existing lots or tracts may be eliminated, again, based on environmental or other needs identified in Forest Plans. But, it is expected that the statistics will decline only slightly. The program continues as one of the most recognizable in the region and the Forest Service, leaving its distinctive imprint on the landscape.

REFERENCES CITED

American Forestry
1921 Summer Homes on the National Forests. American Forestry 27(330):413.

Author unknown
N.D. Conquering the West, the Federal Lands Question. pp. 87-95.

Author unknown
1920s Recreation, Recreation in Relation to National Forest Management. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 11pp.

Author unknown
1960 Yes, A Summer Home in a National Forest! Good Housekeeping 150 April: 172.

Ayres, R. W.
1914 Instructions in Issuing Permits for Camp Sites: Circular for District Rangers; January 29, 1914. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest, Sonora, CA. 1p.

Ayres, Robert W. and Wallace Hutchinson
1927 The National Forests of California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Miscellaneous Circular No. 94. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 34pp.

Bachman, Earl E.
1967 Recreation Facilities: A Personal History of Their Development in the National Forests of California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, California Region. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 9pp.

Barrett, L. A.
1932 Recreation. *In* Copeland Resolution Report: Senate Resolution 175; file designation R - CAL. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. pp. 114-118.

Bean, Walton and James J. Rawls
1988 California: An Interpretive History. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 522pp.

Bellomy, M. D.
1956 National Forest Summer Homes. American Forests (September 1956):21, 51.

Berg, Donald James
1975 Second Homes on the National Forests: Changing Patterns and Values of Recreational Land Use in California. PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. 222pp.

Breck, Edward
1908 The Way of the Woods: A Manual for Sportsmen in Northeastern United States and Canada. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 436pp.

Breck, Henriett S.
1904 Camping in the Redwoods. Out West 20(Jan-June):401-401.

Brown, Helen Weigel
1946 A Kingdon for a Song. House Beautiful, vol. 88, July: pp71, 104-105.

Brown, Wm. S. and S. B. Show
1944 Challenge to Exploitation and Monopoly, 1906-1920. Chapter XI: California Rural Land Use and Management: A History of the Use and Occupancy of Rural Lands in California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region, pp. 242-349.

Bryant, Harold Child
1929 Outdoor heritage. Los Angeles: Powell Publishing Company.

Carhart, Arthur H.
1920a L-Uses Memorandum to the White River National Forest, dated February 1, 1920. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 3pp.

1920b L-Uses Memorandum to the White River National Forest, dated April 7, 1920. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 6pp.

Carnall, N. C.
1889 California Guide for Tourists and Settlers. San Francisco: Carnall-Fitzhugh-Hopkins. 49pp.

Carr, Ethan and Steve McNiel
1999 The Cultural Landscape of Mineral King, Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks: Determination of Eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. National Park Service, Denver Service Center. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 98pp.

Cawley, R.McGreggor
1993 Federal Land, Western Anger: The Sagebrush Rebellion and Environmental Politics. Lawrence: University of Kansas. 195pp.

Cecil, George H.
1917 Summer Homes in Oregon Forests. Sunset: The Pacific Monthly 39 (August):71-72.

Christiansen, Ray
1966 No More Leases of Cabin Sites by U.S. San Francisco Examiner (November 15, 1966):60.

Coggeshall, John M. and Jo Anne Nast
1988 Vernacular Architecture. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. 203pp.

The Comptroller General of the United States
1963 Report to the Congress of the United States: Review of Recreation and Other Selected Land Use Activities, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. General Accounting Office. Washington, D.C. 53pp.

Conners, Pamela A.
1993 Historical Overview of Recreation Residences on the Stanislaus National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Stanislaus National Forest. Sonora, CA. 67pp.

Cox, Thomas R.
1985 Americans and Their Forests: Romanticism, Progress, and Science in the Late Nineteenth Century. Journal of Forest History 29 (October 1985, no. 4):156-168.

Cocroft, Thoda
1930 Summer-Home Sites in the National Forests. Saturday Evening Post 202 (April, no. 41)214, 218.

Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall
1969a Study of Federal Public Land Laws and Policies Relating to Use and Occupancy: Summary (Chapters I & II). Prepared under contract with the Public Land Law Review Commission. Los Angeles: Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall. 124pp.

1969b Study of Federal Public Land Laws and Policies Relating to Use and Occupancy: Volume I (Chapters I - IX). Prepared under contract with the Public Land Law Review Commission. Los Angeles: Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall. 469pp.

1969c Study of Federal Public Land Laws and Policies Relating to Use and Occupancy: Volume II (Chapters X - XIV). Prepared under contract with the Public Land Law Review Commission. Los Angeles: Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall. 304pp.

1969d Study of Federal Public Land Laws and Policies Relating to Use and Occupancy: Volume III (Chapters XV - XVII). Prepared under contract with the Public Land Law Review Commission. Los Angeles: Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall. 174pp.

1969e Study of Federal Public Land Laws and Policies Relating to Use and Occupancy: Volume IV (Appendices). Prepared under contract with the Public Land Law Review Commission. Los Angeles: Daniel, Mann, Johnson, and Mendenhall. 234pp.

Davis Richard C., editor

1983 Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History, Volume 1. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. 400pp.

Dodd, Douglas W.

1995 Recreation Residence Assessment: Historical Overview of Recreation Residences on Los Padres National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, Goleta, CA. 103pp.

DuBois, Coert

1916 Summer Homes on the National Forests. *In:* the Sixth Biennial Report of the State Forester of the State of California, pp. 47-50. Sacramento: California State Printing Office. N.p.

Gallup, Aaron A.

1989 Historic Architectural Survey Report for Big Bear Bridge Replacement Project on Highway 18 at Big Bear Dam, Big Bear Lake, San Bernardino County, California. Office of Environmental Analysis, Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 151pp.

Good, Albert H.

1935 California State Park Division, *Park Structures and Facilities.*

Graves, Henry S.
1913 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture for 1913. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 56pp.

1915a The Handbook for Campers in the National Forests in California. U.S. Department of Agricutural, Forest Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 48pp.

1915b Instructions Regarding Term Occupancy Permits. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 4pp.

1916 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture for 1916. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 36pp.

Graves, Jackson Alpheus
1912 Out of Doors, California and Oregon. Los Angeles: Grafton Publishing Co. 122pp.

Greeley, William B.
1920 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 34pp.

1923 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 56pp.

1926 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 47pp.

Griswold, Norman W.
1883 Beauties of California: Including Bid Trees, Yosemite Valley, Geysers, Lake Tahoe, and Donner Lake, etc. San Francisco: H. S. Crocker and Co. 58pp.

Guillou, Helen Blasdale
1976 Lower Emerald Bay Tract Number Two: A History of a Forest Service Summer Home Area in the El Dorado Naitonal Forest, Lake Tahoe, California 1932-1976. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Lake Tahoe, CA. 79pp

Headley, Donn
1991 Angeles National Forest Administrative History. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest, Arcadia, CA. 445pp.

Holder, Charles Fredrick
1910 Recreations of a Sportsman on the Pacifc Coast. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 399pp.

Jackson, John Brinckerhoff
1984 Discovering the Vernacular Landscape. New Haven: Yale University Press. 165pp.

Keithley, E. S.
1929 Uncle Sam, Landlord. Journal of Forestry XXVII:246-250.

Kemp, Oliver
1908 Wilderness Homes: A Book of the Log Cabin. New York: The Outing Publishing Company. 155pp.

King, Clarence
1872 Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company. 292pp.

Koval, Ana B.
1990 Historic Resources of the Nevada Side of the Tahoe Basin. Alpengroup and Rainshadow Associates. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. South Lake Tahoe, CA. 170pp.

Lancaster, Clay
1986 The American Bungalow. *In*: Common Places, Readings in American Vernacular Architecture, Dell Upton and John Michael Vlach.editors. Athens: The University of Georgia Press. Pp 79-106.

Masterpiece Productions
1988 Adirondack Architecture. http://www.telenet.net/users/maggie/arch1.htm

McAlester, Virginia and Lee McAlester
1988. A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 525pp.

McCarthy, G. Michael
1995 The First Sagebrush Rebellion: Forest Reserves and States Rights in Colorado and the West, 1891-1907. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 15pp.

McIntyre, Rhea E.
N.d. Deadman's Flat Improvement Association Roster and By-Laws. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest, Sonora, CA. 56pp

McNiel, Steve
1994 A Programmatic Approach for Identifying and Evaluating Recreation Residences on the Angeles National Forest, Region 5 – California. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest, Arcadia, CA. 50pp.

Murchie, Elmer Smith
N. d. Cabin Fever. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Sierra National Forest, Fresno, CA. 39pp

Noble, Allen G.
1984 Wood, Brick, and Stone: The North American Settlement Landscape. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press. 160pp.

Ore, Janet
1997 Jud Yoho, "the Bungalow Craftsman," and the Development of Seattle Suburbs. *In*: Shaping Communities, Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, VI, Carter L. Hudgins and Elizabeth Collins Cromley, editors. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press. Pp.231-243.

Palmer, Kevin (Lex) and Alexandra C. Cole
1998 Historic Structure and National Register Eligibility Study for Tenured Recreation Residences within the Santa Ynez Recreation Tract, Los Padres National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, Goleta, CA. 228pp.

Pinchot, Gifford
1905 Report of the Forester for 1905. *In* Annual Reports, Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. pp 199-237.

1907 Report of the Forester for 1906. *In* Annual Reports, Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 43pp.

1908 Report of the Forester for 1907. *In* Annual Reports, Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 40pp.

Poppeliers, John C., Allen Chambers, Jr., and Nancy B. Schwartz
1983 What Style Is It? Building Watchers Series. Historic American Buildings Survey, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press. 112pp.

Potter, Albert F.
1917 Report of the Forester. *In* Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 36pp.

Public Land Law Review Commission

1970 One Third of the Nation's Land: A Report to the President and to the Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 342pp.

Rideout, Mrs. Jacob Barzilla
1889 Camping out in California. San Francisco: R. R. Patterson. 237pp.

Robertson, F. Dale
1987 2720 Memorandum: Recreation Residences; Future Use Determinations. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (April 2, 1987). Unpublished Manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

Rothman, Hal K.
1997 "A Regular Ding-Dong Fight": The Dynamics of Park Service-Forest Service Controversy During the 1920s and 1903s. *In American Forests, Nature, Culture and Politics*, Char Miller, editor. University Press of Kansas. pp. 109-124.

Rowley, William D.
1985 U.S. Forest Service Grazing and Rangelands. College Station: Texas A&M University Press. 270 pp.

Sherman, E. A.
1916 Use of the National Forests of the West For Public Recreation. *In* Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters, Vol. XI, No. 3 (July 1916), pp. 293-296.

1925. Outdoor Recreation on the National Forests. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest History Society, Durham, NC. 8pp.

Singer, Caroline
1918 Shop-Girl's Summer Home. Sunset: The Pacific Monthly 39 (August):34-36.

Southern Pacific Company
1890 California: It's Attractions for the Invalid, Tourist, Capitalist and Homeseeker. San Francisco: H. S. Crocker and Co. 47pp.

Steen, Harold K.
1976 The U.S. Forest Service: A History. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 356pp.

Sunset: The Pacific Monthly
Vacations Made East: How Uncle Sam Invites the Family Out to His Place in the Country. 39 (August):34-38, 71-72.

Supernowicz, Dana and Steve McNiel
1992 A Programmatic Approach for Identifying and Evaluating Recreation Residences on the Eldorado National Forest, Region 5 - California: Atwood and Strawberry Summer Home Tracts. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville, CA. 146pp.

1997 A Programmatic Approach for Identifying and Evaluating Recreation Residences on the Angeles National Forest, Region 5 - California: Historical Context of the Angeles National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Angeles National Forest, Arcadia, CA. 42pp.

Supernowicz, Dana E. and Lamonte Richford
1987 Contextual History for Recreation Residences in the Pacific Southwest Region. *In* U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. A Thematic Study of Recreation Residences in the Pacific Southwest Region. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 23pp.

Sweeley, Frank M.
1937 Major Factors for Consideration in National Forest Recreation in Region 5. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 3pp.

Tweed, William C.
1980 Recreation Site Planning and Improvement in National Forests, 1891-1942. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, FS-354. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 29pp.

Tweed, William C., Laura E. Soulliere, and Henry G. Law
1977 National Park Service Rustic Architecture: 1916 - 1942. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 119 pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
1905 The Use of the National Forest Reserves: Regulations and Instructions, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 142pp.

1906 The Use Book: Regulations and Instructions for the Use of the National Forest Reserves. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1915 The Use Book: A Manual for Uses of the National Forests. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1955 Forest Service Manual. Vol. 3, Sec. G, Amended January 1955. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1968 Forest Service Manual. Title 2300 - Recreation Management, Amended December 1968. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1979 Private Recreation Residences on National Forest System Lands. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 2pp.

1993 The Principal Laws Relating to Forest Service Activities. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 1184pp.

1994a Forest Service Manual. Title 2300 - Recreation Management, Amended June 1994. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1994b Forest Service Manual. Title 2700 - Special Uses, Amended June 1994. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California District
1924 Recreation and Special Use Administrative Guide. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 60pp.

1927 Supplement to Recreation and Special Use Administrative Guide, Residence Standards. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. Pages 55a, 55b,

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California National Forest Region
1936 Accomplishment Report. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region
1946 Administrative Guide for Special Uses. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 78pp.

1959 Forest Service Summer Home Policy. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 2pp.

1969 Summer Home Guideline & Checklist. R5-2300-29, Issued 6/69. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 4pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Cleveland National Forest
1942 Recreation Plan: Cleveland National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Cleveland National Forest, Rancho Bernardo, CA. 42pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest
1926 Recreation Plan and Policy Statement of the Eldorado National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville, CA.

1949 Uses – Eldorado – Residence, May 2, 1949, memorandum. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville.

1996 Guidelines for Recreation Residences: Eldorado National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville, CA. 45pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest
1939 Los Padres National Forest Recreation Plan. Unpublished manuscript on file with the Eleanor Childers Archive of Forest History, Los Padres National Forest Heritage Center. N.p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Mendocino National Forest
1958 Private Camps or Homes on National Forest Lands: Standards of Design. *In* Special Use Permit issued to Fred Wessa, dated March 9, 1958. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

1968 2710 (2300) letter to Fred Wessa, dated March 8, 1968. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region
1990 A Thematic Study of Recreation Residences in the Pacific Southwest Region. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5
1947 Administrative Guide for Special Uses, R-5 Amendment #1, March 11, 1947. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

1981 Forest Service Manual. Title 2700 - Land Uses Management; Region 5 Supplement No. 104, 10/81, 2721.23b. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 6pp.

1986 Forest Service Handbook. Region 5 Supplement No. 1, October 1986; FSH 2709.11 - Special Uses Handbook, Chapter 21, Recreation Residence. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 10pp.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest
1928 Atlas Book A-2: San Bernardino National Forest Recreation Plan and Policy Statement. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, San Bernardino National Forest, San Bernardino, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Sequoia National Forest
1945 Special Use Permit issued to Louis and Dessie Olsen, dated 7/26/45. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest
1940 Recreation Management Plan of the Stanislaus National Forest. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Stanislaus National Forest. Prepared by Junior Forester Fredrick A. Meyer and Associate Forester F. M. Sweeley. N.p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office, Lands
1993 National Recreation Residence Review and Action Plan. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 52pp.

U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service
1918 Report of the Director of the National Park Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. N.p.

1935 Park Structures and Facilities. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. N.p.

Upton, Dell, ed.
1985 America's Architectural Roots: Ethnic Groups that Built America. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press. 193pp.

Waugh, Frank A.
1917 Recreation Uses on the National Forests: A Study of their Extent and Character With a Discussion of Public Policies and Recommendations as to Methods of Development and Administration. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 160pp.

1918a Landscape Engineering in the National Forests. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office. 21pp.

1918b Recreation Uses on the National Forests. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. N.p.

Williams, Gerald W.
1998 USDA Forest Service and Revenue Sharing with States, 1905-1998. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 19pp.

Wilson, Mary
1984 Log Cabin Studies. Cultural Resources Report No. 9. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Ogden, UT. 77pp.

Wood, Ruth Kedzie
1914 The Tourist's California. New York: Dodd, Mead. 395pp.

Young, W.D.
1917 Shop-Girl's Summer Home. Sunset: The Pacific Monthly 39 (August):36-38.

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

PROPERTY TYPES

Two basic property types characterize Forest Service administered recreation residences: recreation residence tracts and recreation residence lots. The tracts reflect, under National Register Criterion A, the Forest Service vision of recreation residence planning and administration. The residence lots reflect, under National Register Criteria A and C, both Forest Service and homeowner visions of the recreation residence phenomenon.

Because the last tract in California was developed in 1959, home sites have become fixed in number. There are occasions where a residence is rebuilt following a disaster; but, because of Forest Service policy, no new tracts have been laid out. Therefore, the entire population of recreation residence tracts can be studied and evaluated. All buildings and features within tracts are included in the analysis.

Recreation residence tracts are the primary property type and unit of analysis. All original design and approval for recreation residences was done at the tract level. A tract had to be surveyed by a forest official and a plat map provided to the Forest Service regional office for review. Tracts can consist of from one to over 400 buildings, as well as road systems and features such as pathways, boat docks, and bridges.

Recreation residence tracts can be conveniently subdivided into three main property subtypes: settings, community patterns, and lot arrangements. Settings include characteristics and associations of views and orientation, topography and landscape features, vegetation, etc. Community patterns include common spaces and structures, such as roads, water systems, community halls, and docks that are used by all the residents of the tract and frequently managed by associations. Lots are the basic units of the tract subdivision, the locations of the privately owned recreation residences, but arranged in a pattern designed by the Forest Service.

The recreation residence lot property type can also be subdivided. Lots, at a minimum, contain the primary residence. Most also contain outbuildings and cultural landscape features. Recreation residences, i.e., primary residences, are rustic, vernacular architecture, of log, wood frame, and/or stone construction techniques; those construction techniques provide appropriate property subdivisions for the primary residence types. Outbuildings include such structures as garages, sleeping quarters, sheds, outhouses, and well houses. Landscape features include driveways, walkways, terracing, patios, recreational features like horseshoe pits, plantings, and an array of additional features.

PROPERTY TYPE DESCRIPTION - PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Steve McNiel analyzed a sample of recreation residences previously surveyed in the study area. The analysis included 55 tracts and 1,768 lots (for 24 of the tracts landscapes were analyzed), representing a range of settings, and covering elevations roughly from 800 to 8000 feet (McNiel 2000a; 2000b). The analysis has yielded useful information about the way recreation residences were sited, designed, and constructed. The landscape and lot/building characteristics relate directly to the two property types, tracts and lots; and thus, they allow for the following generalized descriptions of the property types, and their character-defining features, as to develop typical examples of the resource. It also allows for the identification of unique characteristics that contribute or do not contribute.

Recreation Residence Tract Characteristics

While they embody some of the physical characteristics of urban communities--planned lot arrangements, water systems, roads and developed circulation routes, and single-family homes--recreation residence tracts are not simply urban or suburban communities placed in a rural setting. Urban or suburban subdivisions exhibit generally larger, more densely designed, rectilinear layout designs. They are more homogenous and are less tied to natural features on a site, and often their development involves removal of those natural features that inhibit a more practical use of the area (Ames 1998). On the other hand, recreation residence tracts are also unlike single cabins or small ranch groupings of buildings in the woods. The informal community of homes, with its common areas and features, creates an entirely different ambiance. Recreation residence tracts lie perhaps somewhere in-between, and are unique in this respect.

Setting Characteristics

- **Orientation to Lakes and Rivers** – Six of 24 tracts, or 25% of the tracts in the sample, are directly sited adjacent to lakes. These lakes range in scale from very small, such as Dark Land and Lake Kirkwood, to lakes large enough for medium class boats, such as Silver Lake and Pinecrest. Two kinds of tracts exist, those with single-ring road development, one or two rings of lots deep, and those tracts with combined ring road and compact clustering, more akin to suburban subdivisions. The occurrence of tracts adjacent to rivers is much higher, at 63%. Locations near water were desirable for development, and more opportunities existed to place tracts next to rivers than to lakes.

- **Orientation to Landform, Topography, Elevation, and Rocks** – Landforms have a strong influence on the siting and orientation of architecture. Cabins are often sited on hillsides, the most prevalent type of landform that occurs on lots. Other frequently occurring landforms include cliffs, rocky riversides, outcroppings, and knolls. Many cabins are sited on difficult topography, and the foundations and general massing of these buildings respond to elevation changes.

The percent of cabins with a strong relationship to elevation change is fairly high. Where this is not the case, the tract names often reflect this, such as Manker Flats. As might be expected, those few residences built on sites with no elevation change tend to have level foundations, while those with greater elevation change tend to have multiple stories or stepped foundations, and elevated decks on the downhill side. Another less adaptive solution to dealing with elevation change is seen in those cabins with flat foundations supported on the downhill side by tall posts.

Large rocks occur in many tracts and are a dominant influence on siting and orientation. Some tracts are covered with large rocks, such as Glacier Tract, where every cabin uses rocks as part of the foundation or is placed adjacent to a rock. Other sites have decorative rocks that become part of the surrounding landscaping, incorporated into patios, walls, or planters. As elevation increases, so does rock as an element of the natural setting, and so does the use of rock. This is an excellent example of how recreation residences blend with their natural setting.

- **Incorporation of Native and Exotic Vegetation** – Trees grow on almost all sites, and are the most common natural feature found in relationship to buildings. The most obvious examples are where L-shaped residences were built around an existing tree. In the sample, northern tracts have fewer cabins oriented to particular trees. Perhaps this is due to the pervasiveness of trees in northern sites; where they are less common, trees are emphasized.

  The percent of cabins with evidence of landscaping or gardening is high. The desire to enhance the area immediately adjacent to cabins is clear, and ranges from planting a few shrubs or annuals to full landscaping with planters, walks, water features, and a variety of plants. Food gardening is rare because of short growing seasons and limited occupancy. Northern and middle zone tracts have fewer developed landscape elements, while those in the southern sample almost all have them. Again, lack of dense vegetation may have led to greater planting on the part of the residents in the south.

  The use of exotic vegetation was not approved in policy. In reality, however, the homeowners frequently modified their cultural landscapes with exotic vegetation. Thus, exotic vegetation became one of the characteristics of recreation residence cultural landscape features.

Community Patterns

- **Roads and Developed Circulation** – In many cases, the orientation of individual residences to roads is a function of landform and topography. In narrow valleys or restricted terraces, a main road might be the only possibility for access. In other areas, such as Pinecrest on the Stanislaus, where a broad valley and lake edge exist, the forest often laid out a network of smaller roads. Some times there

are linear frontage roads that parallel the main highway and provide access for subsequent rows of lots. Circulation patterns in some tracts, e.g., Echo Lake on the Eldorado and Huntington on the Sierra, are primarily dependent on water or lake access.

In the sample, 15 out of 22 tracts have 50% or more of their lots oriented to a main highway. A slight trend can be seen among those tracts that do have only main roads. This type of tract layout is more likely to occur at higher elevations, and this is probably directly related to the increased steepness in slopes and lack of large flat spaces on higher mountain slopes.

Tracts are often designed with subsidiary frontage roads serving clusters or strings of cabins. There is a clear trend in tracts at lower elevations to have more recreation residences related to frontage roads than in tracts at higher elevations.

The percent of lots with some form of developed circulation is high. These improvements range from simple dirt paths to elaborate walks, ramps, bridges, parking areas, or pedestrian paths. They are part of the network that provides access to the lots, community features, and to landscape features.

Lot Arrangements

Tracts were usually laid out by a forest officer and were designed to fit each particular location. In many cases the structure for the tract was supplied by a strong natural element such as a lake, river or valley while in other cases, it appears that the main organizing feature was an existing or new road, frontage road or trail, as described above. Each lot was placed to provide at least one buildable area and yet were arranged to yield the most efficient use of the land. The ideal layout appears to have been one in which lots shared common side boundaries with the front and back of the lot paralleling the access road and a natural feature such as a river.

The overall density of lots in a tract was related to the topography and occurrence of features such as rock outcrops or wetlands. These features were often located between individual lots or clusters of lots and lowered the overall density of the tract. Lots were ideally at least 100 feet along one axis and sometimes were nearly square. However, thousands of irregular lots exist, as most were laid out in relation to some local site feature or condition that required the ideal rectangular shape to be modified.

The shape of the tract arrangements vary as widely as the topography and site features they respond to. However, most seem to reflect natural features they are sited next to, such as linear arrangements along streams. On flat land, with few constraints, some resemble traditional subdivision forms from the1920s and 30s, but without the alleys. It seems that none of the tracts were designed as arbitrarily curvilinear layouts as was popular in the post WWII suburban housing tracts. As is true with all human settlements, many probably followed patterns of use established by Native Americans, pioneers or early recreationists before the advent of second home tracts.

- **Linear Arrangements** - Many riverside tracts, such as those along the American River in the Eldorado form an almost continuous line on one side of the river or the other, being broken only when outcrops or side tributaries entered the main river. In some cases these unbroken strings of lots exist on both sides of the river with an automobile or pedestrian bridge linking the two sides of the tract. A similar, linear pattern exists around the edge of many lakes.

- **Dendritic Arrangements** - Tracts that were built on ridges or in canyon bottoms often have a dendritic or branching arrangement with lots following the road system, which also branches into smaller and smaller driveways the further they extend into the canyon. In these tracts it is not unusual for entire strings of lots to be isolated from other lots, separated by ridgelines.

- **Grid Arrangements** - Tracts organized around road systems on flatter sites often resemble a traditional suburban neighborhood, with cabins double loaded on both sides of the road and cross streets that form a typical grid pattern. Often, these grid patterns vary in their rigidity with streets curving to respond to steep topography, wet areas, or other natural features.

Recreation Residence Lot Characteristics

Recreation residence lots consist, at a minimum, of a residence. Most of the time, outbuildings and cultural landscape features have been added.

Residence Characteristics

- **Stories** – In the sample, a large majority of the cabins is more than one story; most are one-and-one-half stories, showing a preference for incorporation of lofts or other similar partial story construction, especially where slope dictated a small foot print. However, there are two and more-than-two-story structures as well, despite the fact that the Forest Service encouraged single story residences or low, inconspicuous buildings that "fit the ground" (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region 1946:30).

- **Ground Plan** – Many of the residences are rectangular or L-shaped in plan; but there is obviously quite a bit of variability, including square, T-shaped, cruciform, U-shaped and other irregular ground plans. This variability probably generally results from additions and modifications, changing the ground plan over time.

- **Construction elements** – Wood frame construction overwhelmingly predominates. Stone construction appears at all elevations; log is uncommon. On the wood frame structures, board and batten and shiplap siding are common, followed by plywood and shingle. Post and pier foundations are common; however, at lower elevations continuous footings are used extensively, perhaps to discourage small animals from living under structures.

- **Roofs** – Gabled roofs are the most common; shed roofs are relatively common. Hipped, flat, and more complex roofs are rare. Metal roofing materials are most common, but are probably modern. They were not permitted until tinted, anodized metal roofs were made available in the 1970s. Wood and asphalt shingle are common and are probably historic or at least more generally in keeping with the historic character of the residences. Slate, asphalt and gravel, asbestos, tile, and composition were used to a lesser degree. Some had galvanized metal roofs historically. Medium pitched roofs, 30 to 45 degrees, are common. There is a correlation between elevation and roof pitch. Shallower pitched roofs are generally found at lower elevations and steeper roofs at higher elevations. However, extremely steep roofs are uncommon.

- **Fenestration** - Asymmetrical window patterns are common and in keeping with the rustic, less formal character of the residences. Casement and sliding windows are common, and wood windows are highly characteristic of the property type. While aluminum windows are common they are clearly not historic and are visually intrusive. Steel and simple glass inset windows are rare. A fair number of the windows has shutters, although most do not. Shutters are a simple, practical ornamentation that fit the rustic look of the cabins.

- **Chimneys** – Chimneys were made of metal or stone; brick was not allowed. Most chimneys were placed at the exterior ends of buildings. A centerpiece of many cabins was the fireplace, often built of massive rocks or river stone.

- **Porches and Decks** – Decks and porches are extremely common. Decks are in the majority, probably because of the need to extend the living space over uneven terrain and elevation changes. Most occur on the front of the building, but they occur on all sides, taking advantage of the outdoor environment to extend the living space and enjoy the scenery.

- **Modifications** – Documentation shows that the construction of recreation residences often took several years or longer, despite the two-year limit, and that modifications through time were highly common. The sample bears this out.

Lot Outbuilding Characteristics

To survive in a mountain retreat, a wide variety of needs must be met. But, two are basic: drinking water and sanitary treatment of human waste. Both of these needs have led to adaptations and additions to the basic residence to a large extent in the form of outbuildings, such as well houses, pump houses, generator houses, and, historically, outhouses. Most tracts have between 50% and 70% of their lots containing one or more outbuildings. It appears that tracts are similar in their addition of outbuildings to individual lots. The existence of outbuildings does not appear to be dependant on elevation or setting. Nor does the application of past Forest Service policy in different zones (or more likely from one forest to another) appear to be an important factor.

The number of outbuildings greatly affects the functional and visual aspects of a tract. The more outbuildings on a lot, the more likely that it has taken on the character of a clustered homestead. The placement of several outbuildings around an interior space tends to define more private spaces without resorting to fences or hedges. This is ultimately why outbuildings are discouraged in Forest Service policy, where the public land aspects are considered important. A single cabin in the woods is less private, but allows for more free flowing access to the site.

Functional reasons for placing outbuildings also dictate the number of separate structures as well. For instance, a shed might be placed to block wind on the site.

The sample shows a trend toward more outbuildings per lot at lower elevations. Less known is the historical condition. At the very least, every cabin would have had an outhouse, and today, hundreds of these have been removed, put out-of-service, or adaptively reused.

Lot Cultural Landscape Feature Characteristics

The percent of cabins directly oriented to driveways is few. While many have dirt or gravel parking areas, few have traditional suburban, paved, driveways, and where they do occur they often provide traction in steep areas or to control erosion. The Forest Service discouraged paved driveways in order to maintain the rustic character of the sites. Circle drives and arced drives on corner lots occur on occasion. Though a small portion of the residences is not accessed by automobile, most were designed with them in mind. Transportation to and from the residence was an important factor in the layout design.

A variety of cultural features is represented, many common adaptations that people have always made to living areas. Only relatively permanent, historic cultural elements are considered here because of their relevance to historic evaluations. In the rustic landscape, these include: sitting rocks and stumps, or built-in seats; stepping stones and stairs for casual circulation and access; brick or stone barbecues popular in the period between 1915 and 1960; patios made of gravel, stone, or concrete platforms; edging or low walls or terracing of stone or logs; ramps and bridges.

PROPERTY TYPE SIGNIFICANCE

Recreation residence tracts on California's national forests maybe eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C. These two criteria are largely interdependent. The land use policies that allowed for and guided the look of recreation residences on national forests make them eligible under Criterion A. But, these policies also deal with aesthetic and design issues, with guidelines for the rustic, vernacular characteristics that make them eligible under Criterion C. The homeowners were the other major player in this effort, and thus, the partnership exists that Paul Starrs calls, "the influential establishment forces and the vernacular 'doers'" as producers of the cultural landscape (Starrs 1996:125).

Frequently, vernacular architecture is determined eligible under Criterion A. Vernacular architecture embraces a diverse range of folk and mass-produced building forms and decorative features that do not, in and of themselves, constitute a formal style of architecture (Wyatt 1987:4-5, 24-25). However, the regional contextual history (Chapter 5) demonstrates strong ties of recreation residences and their rustic vernacular architecture, with trends and forms popular in the west in the first few decades of the 20th century. Thus, Criterion C is also important.

Criterion A - Properties can be eligible for the National Register if they are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

The historic significance under Criterion A of recreation residence tracts, essentially rural historic landscapes, resides in the fact that, in the early years of the 20th century, federal law and Forest Service policy allowed for, and even encouraged, construction of private recreation residences on public national forest lands as a means for developing recreation opportunities and for resource protection.

Recreation residence tracts have played a complex and intriguing role in the evolution of land use policy in the Forest Service, a role that can be best understood within its larger context of recreation as a forest use (Chapter 2, contextual history). The Forest Service supported and even promoted the establishment of recreation residences, from the beginning of its authority to permit such uses until at least the 1950s. New development in the program was finally discontinued in the 1960s. When all is said and done, the recreation residence phenomenon had a substantial impact on the agency, the homeowners, the recreating public, and the landscape.

The Occupancy Permit Act of 1915 generated the recreation residence program on National Forest lands, and the Forest Service developed and implemented regulations and direction on creating recreation residence tracts (Chapter 3, contextual history). There were a few tracts established under earlier laws; but they were rare, and most were incorporated into tracts later developed under the 1915 Occupancy Permit Act. Tracts were usually established in areas of recreation activity, such as around hot springs and lakes, or along rivers and roads.

Earlier Forest Service guidance was very general; however, through time, guidelines for recreation residences became more specific. The intent of these guidelines was to ensure that the tracts and residences evolved in certain ways and not in others. The policy of individual forests varied at times and even played a role in deviating from the broader aesthetic goals, but they generally held to the importance of a rustic architectural style, harmonizing with the environment.

Recreation residence tracts also are significant under Criterion A because they represent the private recreational use of public lands. In the administrative history of the Forest Service, this presented a perpetual conflict with the principle of broad public access to recreational opportunities on the forests. This conflict was played out in numerous attempts to change policies to accommodate more public use.

Local Description

The regional contextual history establishes the national and statewide significance of recreation residence tracts. There may, however, be local information related to a particular tract or group of tracts that could require additional study or even trigger development of a separate evaluation based on local significance.

An example where additional information was needed to evaluate a tract as part of this regional strategy was Pinecrest on the Stanislaus, where the first homeowner's association in the nation was established. Although this development has a local focus, inasmuch as it it unique to Pincrest, this information is important because directly contributes to the national and regional context. In such cases, a description of significant local environmental, social, and/or political factors may be necessary. Especially when integrity is borderline, local significance may play a role. However, where a tract is eligible under the broader regional context and where local history or factors unique to a tract or group of tracts do not play a significant role in the tract's recreation residence eligibility, a separate local history is not needed. The local descriptive data required in the inventory guides would suffice. Significance will almost always be at the regional or national level. Local significance may be pursued when it directly adds to the regional and/or national level context.

Additional information may be provided for a group of tracts because they are linked. Examples are where they were planned and developed at the same time, or because they shared a common geographic setting.

There may be cases where tracts are eligible for reasons not directly related to the recreation residences history. An example may be a tract associated with an important person in history, major hydroelectric and resort development, or other contexts outside that of recreation residences. Work such as this must be done separately; it is not part of the recreation residence strategy evaluation process.

Criterion C – Properties may be eligible for the National Register if they embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent

the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

Recreation residence tracts and buildings are the synthesis of Forest Service management and the inclinations of the builders themselves. But both participants drew on larger cultural trends for their inspiration: turn-of-the-20th century, romantic notions of nature, and the populist thinking of the conservation movement. These influences are summarized in the regional contextual history (Chapter 1); they lead to a better understanding of what makes recreation residences important, and what makes them unique.

The participation of both the Forest Service and the homeowners in developing the rustic vernacular character of these recreation residence tracts is the basis for determining their historic significance under Criterion C. When recreation residence tracts were first developed, it was understood the improvements were to be modest (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1915, Reg. L-38: 136) and spaced so that they were neither so close together nor so far apart that only a few permittees occupied all the choice spots (Graves 1915: 1-2). Soon, these minimal guidelines developed into an emphasis on recreation residences being rustic, simple, and built with native materials (Chapter 3, contextual history). The recreation residence vernacular style that evolved was characterized by asymmetrical lot arrangements, strong relationships between natural and cultural features, and use of native, rustic building materials. It must be noted, however, that there were occasions when Forest Service policy at the local level strayed from the preference for rustic, vernacular style.

The homebuilders and owners, in meeting their own needs and desires, shaped the look and feel of the residences. Their more improvised role usually reinforced the rustic vernacular character, yet at times they preempted policy and created elements incompatible with the rural setting, even so far as creating urban-like buildings or settings. Outbuildings, such as garages, sheds, and outhouses, and small features such as barbeques, fire pits, and retaining walls, were to be approved by forest officers, but were frequently simply added by permittees unofficially, and not originally part of the overall planned construction.

Yet, in the dialectic push and pull between the Forest Service and the homeowners, there was common ground. Both held that rustic character and a tie to the natural environment were important. The two players and their relationship led to the embodiment of distinctive landscape and architectural characteristics. This relationship between the so-called "establishment" and the "vernacular, common folk" (Starrs 1996:127) played a significant role in California's rural history. Thus, the general pattern of events that makes recreation residences eligible under Criterion A is closely tied to Criterion C.

PROPERTY TYPE REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

The following steps lead to registration:

- In order to qualify under Criterion A, a recreation residence tract must have been established during the period of study (1906 - 1959) and under the Occupancy Permits Act of 1915 or earlier authorizing laws. Because Criterion A and C are so thoroughly interdependent, a tract must qualify under both criteria to be determined eligible.

  All recreation residence tracts are associated with the Occupancy Permits Act and earlier authorizing laws, and related Forest Service policy and regulation; this does not automatically make all tracts eligible. First, the tract's period of significance must be within the study period. A tract must also exhibit rustic, vernacular architectural characteristics and retain integrity.

- In order to qualify under Criterion C, a tract must embody the rustic vernacular characteristics that Forest Service policy over the years attempted to foster and reinforce, and that the recreation residence owners implemented on the ground. Outbuildings buildings and associated features should also have been constructed within the period of significance and/or be of similar rustic character to contribute to the residence and tract historic significance. The scale of changes has to be considered. For example, if a property has a large addition outside the period of significance, it should not qualify as a contributor even if the addition is sympathetic. Conversely, a small, incompatible addition might not be inimical to significance.

  - Those most important features of the rustic vernacular recreation residence style and method of construction as a rural community landscape are:

    - Asymmetrical /irregular lot arrangements
    - Incorporation of natural features into cultural features of landscape at tract and lot levels.
    - Use of native and rustic materials for building, such as:
      Rough sawn wood for siding (e.g., board and batten, shiplap, shake/shingle)
      Peeled and unpeeled logs for siding, trim, railings etc.
      Native stone for foundations, fireplaces, buildings, etc.

  - Each recreation residence tract has a distinguishable cultural landscape composed of residences, outbuildings, access roads, trails, and other landscape features. All of these will be considered in the evaluation of a tract.

  - The lifestyle of recreation residence permittees during the period of significance resulted in the construction of vernacular features such as

barbeques, patios, fire rings, rock walls, stone stairs, and plantings of exotic or native vegetation. These will be considered in the evaluation of a tract. Ephemeral, movable objects (e.g., moveable chairs, barbeques, recreation equipment, etc.) will not be considered.

- Recreation residence tracts were built to harmonize with a variety of environments including forested areas, subalpine and alpine settings, along rivers and creeks, next to lakes, and near scenic vistas, combining features such as vegetation, rocks, and bodies of water, etc., with cultural features. Further, these settings are widely variable in appearance, for example, a riverside recreation residence in the eastern escarpment of the Sierra Nevada contrasted with a riverside setting on the westside. The degree to which a tract harmonizes with its particular environment will be considered in the evaluation.

- For several reasons, the interiors of recreation residences will not be considered in these evaluations. While it is recognized that there may be interiors with historic significance, recreation residences are owned by the permittees and the Forest Service has exercised little aesthetic control over them. They are not required to blend with the environment, as are the exteriors. The Forest Service is not normally given access to interiors; and the interiors are not public spaces open to general view.

- Because of continued use over several decades by individuals and families, recreation residences often exhibit a wide variety of modifications. Often, it is difficult to distinguish original from subsequent fabric. It must be recognized, that in the case of this changing property type, there are clear limitations on the ability to identify modifications and date them. The use of approval documents, photographs, and interviews may help determine what and when modifications occurred. However, when these are not available or it is impractical to conduct highly-detailed, intensive research, it will be more important to consider simply whether the modification is sympathetic to the rest of the cabin and compatible with the tract as a whole (Birnbaum 1994:10). As long as the modification does not detract from, but compliments, the vernacular, rustic qualities of the building, the modification will not be considered as negatively impacting a building's eligibility.

- Survey of nearly half of the tracts has shown that most residences were laid out as they were planned, and there is rarely any evidence of individual residences having been moved. In general, lot lines were not changed. So while it is possible, extensive research to identify moved residences is not necessary. Original site plans and subsequent site maps should be compared with existing properties; records should be consulted; and, where reasonable, owners interviewed about moved buildings or

structures. Properties will not be considered contributing if they have been moved from their original site.

- Tract research may show that, as well as being significant regionally under Criteria A and C, a particular recreation residence tract has local significance--environmental, social, and/or political importance--which should documented and be considered as part of the period of significance.

- If a tract is more recent than 1959 (or its residences predominately built after 1959), it will be considered ineligible for the National Register.

- In order to be eligible for the National Register, a tract must retain integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association that embody rustic character and blend with the environment. Integrity of the cultural landscape is important in determining the tract's eligibility as well as architectural integrity of the buildings that make up a tract (see Analysis of Integrity and Scoring Tools below).

IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

IDENTIFICATION METHOD

Important Note: The following guides draw on work that has already been accomplished over the last several years by the Forest Service in California, and are in no way meant to supplant or change inventory and evaluation strategies that have already been successfully used. All previous evaluations are valid and shall remain so. These guides are meant to streamline future inventory and evaluation processes, and to lead to consistent evaluations across all national forests in California.

The goal here is to develop a baseline of data on the recreation residence tracts and lots. This information includes the physical features and the visual and spatial relationships that define the historic character of the landscapes and the residences. This information is used to determine representativeness and uniqueness in the evaluation method below.

Forest Service/Department of Parks and Recreation (FS/DPR) Forms for Recreation Residence Tracts (see Appendix 1)

Consistency in information is important in describing the resource and for comparing residences within a tract and for comparing tracts. The following documentation is needed for data collection, evaluation and integrity analysis, and SHPO consultation:

- FS/DPR district form or similar level of documentation, where a grouping of tracts is appropriate at the multiple tract scale (FSDPR 523D (1/95))

- FS/DPR archaeological/environment form or similar level of documentation for each tract (FSDPR523C (1/95))

- FS/DPR primary form, or similar level of documentation, for each tract (eligible or ineligible) (FSDPR523A (1/95))

- FS/DPR building form or similar level of documentation for each cabin/lot (contributing and noncontributing; not each outbuilding) using the terminology provided in the Forest Service database design or other approved database (FSDPR523B 1/95))

- Historic (if available) and modern photos of each cabin

Tract Summary Data

For each tract, the following inventory information should be provided:

- Tract survey and layout map showing boundaries of site. Current tract boundaries may have changed through time due to management needs. For the purpose of this evaluation, if significance is tied to the historic tract boundary, as opposed to

a changed, current, modern, tract boundary, then the historic tract boundary is identified and used.

- Dates for the tract surveys, when permits were granted, and when construction of recreation residences in the tract commenced and ended.

- A list of references documenting the tract.

- A description of significant local environmental, social, and/or political factors. Where additional information is needed because it directly contributes to the national and regional context, this should be developed in more detail. Where local history does not play a substantive role in the broader regional context, brief descriptive data would suffice.

EVALUATION METHOD

The following provides a rational approach to evaluating recreation residence tracts for their eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. It is based on a method developed by Steve McNiel, Department of Environmental Design, University of California, Davis, in cooperation with the USDA Forest Service.

Traditional methods have long relied on subjective observation to establish a summary evaluation that simultaneously takes into account the various patterns of occurrence of building characteristics and their integrity. This is normally a reasonable approach for an experienced professional to take. However, the complexity and size of this resource has led to use of a more quantitative approach in addition to the professional's judgment.

Period of Significance

The study period for recreation residences is 1906 to 1959. Tract development in California occurred from 1915 to 1959, but the tracts incorporated previously permitted recreation residences, the earliest of which go back to 1906. Recreation residences in California are a finite resource. The last tract was developed in 1959. The same set of policies and guidelines that influenced tract historic character essentially applied that entire length of time. The study period from 1906 to 1959 is not, however, the period of significance, because each tract had different dates of development within that study period.

Period of significance is determined for each individual tract, based primarily on the period during which an individual tract (or a major portion of it) was developed and its recreation residences were built. Also, when some other documented, important local, regional, or national event in the history of a particular tract occurred, this date should be included in the tract's period of significance.

Scale of Analysis

The analysis is done primarily at two scales, and occasionally additional information is obtained at a higher scale. At the landscape level, the tract, its cultural and physical features, vegetation, and views are analyzed as an integrated whole. At the lot level, architectural attributes of individual buildings are analyzed, and then outbuildings and cultural features on the lot are analyzed in relation to the primary building.

Occasionally, several tracts may be associated through history or geography, and this broader grouping may also be studied to gain additional information. This strategy focuses on recreation residence tracts, as the unit of analysis. But it does not exclude the possibility of evaluating tracts as part of districts defined by other contexts in other efforts.

Lot scale

The focus of analysis for architectural attributes is on the permitted building or cabin, because it usually dominates the site, and because, historically, permits were issued primarily for one residence. Architectural attributes include: building siting and orientation, massing, roofs, exterior walls, foundations, additions, windows and doors, chimneys, porches, and decks. Outbuildings, including sheds, garages, outhouses, pump houses, and detached sleeping quarters are also analyzed, but in a more general sense. Are they compatible with the location, materials, and configuration of the main residence? Cultural features or structures on the lot, such as driveways, walkways, barbeques, fire pits, and plantings, should also be compatible with the rustic character of the site and subordinate to the main residence.

Tract scale

The recreation residence tract is tied together by its setting–its historic landscape, which includes cultural features, physical landforms and hydrologic features, vegetation, and views. Cultural features that tie the tract together are its subdivision, road system, community water system, docks, and other constructed features not specifically linked to individual lots. The physical setting includes the landscapes on which the residences are sited, often characterized by rock outcrops, lakes, streams, and other natural features. Vegetation includes the trees, and endemic and exotic plants on the site. Views, along with the physical setting and vegetation, often determined the original placement of a tract on the landscape. The tract is more than just the sum of its lots. An eligible tract is the result of a generalized grouping of buildings and features within the tract boundary that all compliment each other and take advantage of the available view shed in a way consonant with provisions of the Occupancy Permits Act and the policies it generated.

Multiple tract scale

At this scale, several related tracts should be considered together because they share a common development or geographic setting. For instance, several tracts may have been built along a stretch of a river as part of one forest's developmental phase. However, the basic tract level evaluation still forms the basis for eligibility. Broader scale analysis may provide important additional historic information that can be considered in the context. This can be part of the local descriptive information.

Analysis of Representative and Unique Characteristics

Individual attributes are used to assess the holistic and comparative characteristics of a cabin and a tract. Each attribute is compared to a summary of attributes of the whole tract to determine whether a particular attribute represents the norm for the tract or whether that attribute rarely occurs.

Buildings that are determined to be representative of the tract will generally have most of their details match the norm and lie within the tract's the period of significance. Representative buildings will be determined to be contributing structures to eligibility, if they possess historic integrity and date to the period of significance. Unique buildings, on the other hand, might be positively unique or negatively unique, positively or negative reflecting the rustic qualities of a tract.. For example, a cabin might be unique in its use of native stone for foundations or walls, setting it apart from most cabins in a tract but exhibiting a strong reference to rustic, vernacular architecture. Such a building would be rated positively unique and be contributing. However, a cabin that is unique in its use of plywood siding, and aluminum framed windows and doors would be considered negatively unique, lacking integrity of materials and craftsmanship. Cultural landscape features can be analyzed as well, and should be rustic and nonintrusive.

Guiding Principles

Rustic character - Rustic character at the tract scale is evidenced by a close relationship between the natural and cultural features of the site. While they have some characteristics in common with urban communities, rustic, rural communities are characterized by more irregular layouts of lots and circulation routes, and by the incorporation of natural and landscape features into the cultural features. They are not simply urban neighborhoods placed in the countryside.

At the lot scale, rustic is the feeling evoked from a residence, when that residence incorporates native materials in its design, or uses a fabric that produces a complimentary effect with its natural surroundings. For example, in a mountain setting, wood shingles, shakes, rough-sawn or bark siding, logs, and native rock add to the overall rustic quality of a cabin. Residences that evoke a high degree of rustic character have incorporated into their design at least several such rustic materials. The overall shape or form of the residence should lend itself to the rustic look and blend with the environment. The color should complement the natural surroundings. The properties should use indigenous materials and should not overwhelm or overly civilize the recreation residence lot.

Residences that may not be contributing include those that minimally use rustic materials, but do not accentuate the rustic qualities of the property (for example, wood shingles or shakes used solely for roof cladding, combined with smooth-milled boards or plywood for exterior siding). In other cases, rustic materials have been applied, but paint colors and trim do not compliment those materials.

Vernacular Architectural Features - Recreation residences adopted rustic, vernacular, and handcrafted architectural features. These include the use of native materials, of irregular dimensions, or elements of the landscape in the structure. Some, but not all, of the things to look for in different environments are:

- Native rock incorporated into the body of the cabin, foundations, or chimneys
- Unique, rustic designs for porch railings
- Rusticated siding, such as bark or rough-sawn boards

- Unique shutter design
- Use of log construction or log siding
- Incorporation of landscape features into the design

Unique use of materials or styles may be considered here, but still would have to fit the concept of rustic, vernacular architecture to meet both Forest Service guidelines and the general architectural trends used by the homebuilders.

Analysis Process

Occurrences of various attributes may be representative of a tract's historic character, or they may be unique. These occurrences may be analyzed for their representativeness/uniqueness based on summary of all values for individual attributes within tracts.

Assignment of such values is based on the assumption that each tract does have its own character. The values reflect how well a particular attribute represents the special character of the tract. But that special character of a tract--for it to be considered under these guidelines--must be embodied through rustic vernacular elements. Therefore, buildings that use nonrustic materials (e.g., plywood, T-111, etc.) are, by definition, noncontributing.

To obtain the character-defining features of a tract, values are assigned based on the percentage of occurrences of individual attributes within the sample, or tract. To derive the value, count the number of times a particular attribute (e.g., window) is recorded in the tract. Then count the number of times a particular style of the attribute (e.g., wood casement) is recorded. Divide the style occurrence number by the total attribute number to get the percent of occurrence. For instance, if wood casement windows occur 40 out of 200 times, wood casement windows have a value of 20--20% of the total occurrences. Wood double hung, on the other hand, may have a value of 50--50% or 100 out of 200 occurrences of window types within the tract. Therefore, both wood casement and wood double hung windows are character defining, but to differing degrees.

The numbers or percentages may be most easily represented as bar charts. The bars can be perused to identify which characteristics may be representative of (larger bars--higher numbers or percentages) or unique within (smaller bars--lower numbers or percentages) the tract. Similar counts may be made for outbuildings (e.g., how many garages occur in comparison to sleeping quarters or outhouses); or, for cultural landscape features (e.g., how many plantings of native species occur in comparison to plantings of exotics, or, how many fire pits occur in comparison to barbeques). Thus, the representativeness or uniqueness of particular characteristics may be identified for tracts. In some cases, tract attributes may even be compared (e.g., how many have views of lakes versus streams) to identify the typical characteristics for recreation residence tracts within particular areas.

Analysis of Integrity

Integrity of the location, setting

The site or location of a property reflects the relationship between the structure and the place, and should reflect why the tract was built where it was. Since recreation residences were built as tracts, integrity of individual properties may affect the integrity of the overall group. If tract boundaries have changed, the historic rather than the modern boundaries will be used. Moved tracts or residences will not be considered eligible.

Integrity of design, materials, and workmanship

Design is the composition of elements that makes up the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. Design is created from and reflects socio-cultural values, aesthetic preferences, applied technology, and, in the case of recreation residences, a desire to create rustic buildings reflective of natural surroundings.

Properties should have few modifications to the overall design other than routine maintenance, e.g., painting, and electrical and plumbing repairs. If modifications have occurred to a property, such as new siding, roofing, decking, windows, etc., then, those modifications must have been made using materials that conform to the building's historical appearance.

Properties with cosmetic modifications or alterations may be acceptable if those changes are readily reversible. Examples include installing new siding over the old, and, in some cases window replacement. Properties will not be considered contributing elements of the tract, if they have undergone substantial major alterations or additions, which may include major fabric changes, room additions, roof alterations, such as the addition of dormers, bay window additions, etc.

The analysis of integrity uses a method developed by Steve McNiel. The holistic assessment determines the level of integrity at the landscape and component levels. The method employs a six level scale in which recreation residence integrity Level 4 or above would be classified as contributing to a historic tract. As guidelines, at least two thirds of the cabins should have existed during the period of significance and those cabins should retain at least Level 4 or greater integrity for the tract to be eligible to the National Register. While these are not absolute thresholds, they are nonetheless firm guidelines that should be informed, as necessary, by professional judgment.

McNiel Criteria for Integrity Assessments

The following McNiel ratings describe levels of integrity for buildings and their settings, and present general criteria for meeting these levels:

Level 6: The building and site appear to retain their integrity intact with no significant changes in evidence. The building exhibits a strong sense of architectural design and a positive relationship to the setting.

Level 5: The building and site retain their integrity essentially intact. There are few, if any, noticeable changes, and these are limited to features such as deck railings, minor inconsistencies in siding, one or two changes in windows, and other easily reversible changes such as paint color or landscape treatment. Despite modest changes, the building exhibits a strong sense of architectural design and a positive relationship to the setting.

Level 4: The building and site retain a fair amount of integrity and historic character. The building has moderate changes, which are not generally considered visually intrusive enough to destroy its historic integrity. Level 4 structures often include new roofs of appropriate form and color, one or more aluminum windows and doors in inconspicuous locations, new architecturally appropriate, small-scale additions, modified details and finishes. These result in the building maintaining moderate architectural character. The building retains good relationship to its setting.

Tracts with a larger proportion of level 4 buildings and landscapes should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that their eligibility and the count of contributing lots/buildings is clearly defensible. In other words, the presence of a large number of Level 4 lots/buildings may indicate that there is an overall lack of integrity at the Tract scale. In this case, the overall significance and integrity of the tract should be carefully evaluated against the regional typology to determine conclusively whether it meets the registration requirements for a significant recreation residence tract. Once it is determined that the tract is or is not consistent with the regional typology of the rustic recreation residence character, then the architectural characteristics of each lot/building should be noted and evaluated against the tract's own significant representative and unique qualities.

Level 3: Much of the integrity of the building and site has been compromised through poorly designed additions, extensive replacement of original windows and doors with inappropriate materials, changes in siding, or extensive landscape features inappropriate to the rustic surroundings. The building and site might be considered a candidate for rehabilitation to bring it in to line with historic guidelines, but currently it is considered noncontributing to the tract. Due to changes out of character with rustic vernacular architecture, the building has a weak relationship with the setting.

Level 2: Most of the integrity of the building and site has been lost through major alterations and/or additions. Changes such as roof massing and pitch, replacement of siding with materials such as stucco or T1-11 plywood, replacement of the majority of windows, their size or shape, characterize Level 2 buildings. The structure is generally considered beyond an ability to restore its historic character. It exhibits little to no relationship with its setting.

Level 1: The integrity of the building and site has been totally lost through complete or extensive reconstruction using inappropriate architectural scale, forms, and/or materials. The building is considered permanently noncontributing with little or no opportunity for rehabilitation to bring the structure into conformance with the character of the remainder of the tract. Buildings that were destroyed, removed, or moved are Level 1.

New buildings, while they might have been built to reflect the character-defining features of a tract, were constructed outside the period of significance and, therefore, are not contributing under this tract-based evaluation strategy.,

Because recreation residences were often built over a span of several years, additions to the residences themselves, and additions of outbuildings and landscape features sympathetic to the original cabin design, built during the period in which the tract gained significance, will be considered contributing. Those modifications that do not encroach on or erode character do not compromise the integrity of the tract (Birnbaum 1994:15).

Scoring Integrity of Recreation Residence Tract and Recreation Residence Lot Attributes

The following additional scoring tool used to assist in determining whether a tract or lot is a contributor or noncontributor. It serves as a way of quantifying the intuitive process used to determine the six levels, but is not meant to supplant the process described above. It simply adds to the body of knowledge needed to assess integrity. In the end, the professional must stand back and assess integrity based on his/her knowledge of the resource.

As a guide, it is suggested that around and 30% of the overall weight should be placed on the tract/landscape attributes, while 70% should be placed on the lot/residence attributes. These guides are based on the number of physical characteristics analyzed.

Note: There is a line between those lower scores, where integrity for a particular attribute is retained, and those higher scores for attributes where integrity has been lost.

Tract/Landscape Attributes

Cultural features: 0-2

0 -	Tract cultural landscape features (e.g., lot arrangement, road system, docks, etc.) maintain historic rustic character of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association for period of significance.
1 -	Tract cultural landscape features have been modified by intrusion of some minor elements (e.g., installation of electrical lines or surfacing of roads) that do not conform to its historic character and period of significance; however, tract still maintains feel of historic character and association.

2 -	Tract cultural landscape features have been modified by intrusion of some major elements (e.g., realignment of road system or deletion of a large portion of the tract) that do not conform to its historic character and period of significance; or tract cultural landscape features do not embody historic rustic character of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association for its period of significance.

Physical features: 0-2

0 -	Tract physical/natural setting maintains historic rustic character of location, setting, feeling, and association for its period of significance. The tract exhibits a balance between the built and the natural environment.
1 -	Tract physical/natural setting has been modified by minor changes (e.g., stream habitat improvement or removal of some rock); however, it still maintains its historic character for its period of significance.

2 -	Tract physical/natural setting has been modified by major intrusions (e.g., building of a highway or landslide erosion on a hillside) that compromise the feel and association of its historic character; the tract has high density of structures, or a rectilinear or symmetrical layout that does not maintain a rustic feeling. Tract physical/natural setting does not maintain its historic rustic character, location, setting, feeling, or association.

Vegetation: 0-2

0 -	Tract vegetation maintains historic rustic character, feeling, and association for its period of significance (natural vegetative growth and change are expected). A clear sense of the historic landscape still exists.
1 -	Tract vegetation has been modified by minor changes (e.g., clearing of brush, blowdown, or felling of hazard trees); however, it still maintains its historic character for its period of significance. Minor changes can include modest exotic plantings.

2 -	Tract vegetation has been modified by major changes (e.g., large scale logging or forest fire) that compromise the feel and association of its historic character; tract vegetation does not maintain its historic rustic character, feeling, or association. Extensive exotic plantings have diminished the rustic character of the cultural landscape, so that it no longer blends with the natural environment.

Views: 0-2

0 -	Tract near and distant views are consistent with historic rustic character for location, design, setting, feeling, and association.
1 -	Minor intrusions (e.g., phone lines or antennas) affect the near view, but do not compromise historic character of tract.

2 -	Significant intrusions (e.g., large transmission lines or residential development) affect the near or far view, so that the historic location, design, setting, feeling, or association of the tract are compromised.

Lot/residence Attributes

Siting and Orientation: 0-3

0 -	Residence location, siting, and orientation maintain integrity of original location, design, feeling, and association, with historic rustic vernacular recreation residence character; residence fits well within and incorporates rustic landscape.
1 -	Residence has original location and orientation; however, it does not maximize rustic landscape in siting and orientation (e.g., does not take advantage of available views and natural features in its placement), feeling and association.

2 -	Residence has original location and orientation, but siting intrudes on rustic landscape, feeling and association.
3 -	Residence has been moved; or, residence has been removed.

Massing: 0-3

0 -	Residence design, plan, and size maintain integrity of original design, feeling, and association, with historic rustic vernacular recreation residence character; residence design and massing fit well within and incorporate rustic landscape.
1 -	Residence has original design and massing; however, it does not maximize rustic landscape in feeling and association (e.g., dominates or obscures views or natural features, rather than harmonizing or accentuating).
2 -	Residence design, plan, or size has been modified; however, its design modifications are compatible with historic character.

3 -	Residence design, plan, or size has been modified by major changes that noticeably compromise historic character; or, residence design, plan, or size is incompatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.

Roofs: 0-3

0 -	Roof maintains original design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character of recreation residences; if reroofed, historic materials and workmanship match.
1 -	Roof maintains original design, but materials may have changed (e.g., asphalt shingles replace wood shakes); however, workmanship similar and general historic character maintained.

2 -	Roof maintains original design, but materials and workmanship have changed (e.g., metal roof replaces wood shakes) so that they diminish historic character.
3 -	Design of roof changed; noncosmetic, irreversible, major alterations have been made (e.g., changing pitch of roof or adding dormers); or, design, materials, or workmanship of roof not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.

Exterior walls: 0-4

0 -	Exterior walls maintain original design, materials, color, and workmanship compatible with rustic character of recreation residences; if reclad or repainted, historic materials, color, and workmanship match.
1 -	Walls maintain original design, but reclad with changed but similar materials (e.g., reclad with modern rather than historic sized wood shingles), or painted a different but historically compatible color; however, workmanship similar, and historic character maintained.
2 -	Walls maintain original design, but materials and/or workmanship have changed, although compatible with historic character (e.g., wood siding replaces wood shingles); or design changed, but materials and workmanship match historic.

3 -	Wall design, materials, and workmanship have changed but are compatible with historic rustic recreation residence character, but painted an incompatible color.
4 -	Design of walls changed, and permanent modifications made to exterior walls are incompatible with historic character; or, design, materials, or workmanship of walls not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.

Foundations: 0-1

0 -	Foundation maintains design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character of recreation residences; if rehabilitated, materials and workmanship compatible with historic character.

1 -	Design, materials, or workmanship of foundation not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.

Additions: 0-3

0 -	Residence has no addition; or, addition is of design, materials, and workmanship of main structure, within period of significance, and maintains historic feeling and association.
1 -	Addition is of design, materials, and workmanship of main structure, but not within period of significance and not visible in primary views; however, it maintains historic feeling and association.
2 -	Addition has modest changes to design, materials, and workmanship of main structure, and changes are visible in primary views; but, historic feeling and association are maintained.

3 -	Addition makes major changes to design, materials, or workmanship not compatible with main structure; or, historic feeling and association are diminished by addition

Windows and doors: 0-3

0 -	Windows and doors maintain original design, materials, and workmanship compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences; any repairs match original in design, materials, and workmanship.
1 -	Windows or doors modified but design and materials compatible with historic character (e.g., clad wood casement replacing wood casement, or double glazed replacing single glazed windows).

2 -	Window/door materials or design are changed (e.g., replacing wood casement with aluminum sliders), and historic character is diminished; or, windows/doors are not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.
3 -	Windows or doors not compatible with historic character of tract. Window or door placement in walls is changed (i.e., moved, enlarged, added, etc.); historic character is diminished.

Chimneys: 0-2

0 -	Residence had no chimney originally, and this is compatible with rustic design and character of recreation residences; or, residence has original chimney of design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character.
1 -	Residence chimney is later addition, with design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character of recreation residences.

2 -	Loss of chimney or later addition of chimney or original chimney is not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences.

Porches: 0-2

0 -	Residence had no porch originally, and this is compatible with rustic design and character of recreation residences; or, residence has original porch of design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character.
1 -	Porch repaired, modified, or rebuilt with design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character of recreation residences; or porch removed, but removal still compatible.

2 -	Porch modified, rebuilt, or added, and design, materials, or workmanship are not compatible with rustic character of recreation residences, porch removed and not compatible, or original porch not compatible.

Decks: 0-2

0 -	Residence had no deck originally, and this is compatible with rustic design and character of recreation residences; or residence has original deck of design, materials, and workmanship compatible with rustic character; or compatible deck repaired with matching materials and workmanship.
1 -	Deck replaced, with modest changes to design, materials, or workmanship that do not diminish historic character.

2 -	Deck integral to historic residence design removed; or, deck originally constructed, modified, or replaced with design, materials, or workmanship not compatible with historic rustic character of recreation residences

Outbuildings: 0-2

0 -	Lot has no outbuildings; or, outbuildings retain original location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, configuration, feeling, and association of historic rustic recreation residence character.
1 -	Outbuildings have had modest changes to materials, design, workmanship, and configuration, but have not diminished historic character.

---

2 -	Outbuildings are not compatible with location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, configuration, feeling, or association of historic rustic recreation residence character.

Lot cultural features: 0-2

0 -	Cultural landscape features (e.g., picnic areas, walkways, plantings) convey rustic vernacular design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association compatible with historic character.
1 -	Modest cultural landscape feature intrusions (e.g., antennas or inconspicuous satellite dishes) do not detract from historic character.

---

2 -	Significant cultural landscape feature intrusions (e.g., conspicuous satellite dishes or paved driveways) are not compatible with rustic character of historic setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

INTEGRITY RATING SUMMARY

Unit of Analysis	Contributing	Median Score	Noncontributing
Tract/Landscape Attributes – approximately 30%			
Cultural features	0 - 1	1	2
Physical features	0 - 1	1	2
Vegetation	0 - 1	1	2
Views	0 - 1	1	2
Subtotal	0-4		8
Lot/Residence Attributes – approximately 70%			
Siting and Orientation	0 - 1	1.5	2-3
Massing	0 - 2	1.5	3
Roofs	0 - 1	1.5	2-3
Exterior Walls	0 - 2	2	3-4
Foundations	0	.5	1
Additions	0 - 2	1.5	3
Windows and Doors	0 - 1	1.5	2-3
Chimneys	0 - 1	1	2
Porches	0 - 1	1	2
Decks	0 - 1	1	2
Outbuildings	0 - 1	1	2
Lot Cultural Features	0 - 1	1	2
Subtotal	0-14		26-30
TOTALS	0 - 18	19	34-39

INTEGRITY ANALYSIS CROSSWALK

The following table shows how integrity scores relate to integrity levels used in the McNiel method. The cross references have been field validated.

McNiel's Levels	Attribute Score Totals
Eligible Levels and Scores	
Level 6	0 - 5
Level 5	6 - 12
Level 4	13 - 18
Ineligible Levels and Scores	
Level 3	19 - 25
Level 2	26 - 32
Level 1	33 – 39

Significance Statement for Tracts and Their Contributors

The scoring tool cannot be used alone to craft statements of significance. For example, a cabin is not considered a noncontributor because it scored a 35. Each statement of significance must identify how the lot/cabin represents, or fails to represent, the significant historic character of the tract.

The significant historic character of the tract is appropriately determined by using the Strategy's technique of aggregating the results of each component (i.e., windows, roof, landscape feature) to identify those characteristics that are representative of the tract or unique and contributing. By referring to graphic representation of characteristics, such as bar charts, a written description can be crafted of the representative, or significant characteristics of the tract, by identifying those components that are heavily represented in the inventory results. For example, if the inventory results of a tract show that 80% of the cabins have wood-frame casement windows, but roofs are evenly distributed among side-gable, front-gable, and cross-gable, the written description of the significant character of the tract should be specific about wood-frame casement windows and more general about roof types. The statement should also include a description of those unique characteristics that contribute to the rustic feel and workmanship of the tract.

In order to ensure that the significance of the tract is seen as something greater than just the sum of the individual lots, the significance statement should also describe the overall landscape patterns of the tract, and how the lots and residences integrate with the landscape. This integration with the landscape is a key component of the significance

under both Criteria A and C, and is a characteristic that is found at both the individual lot level and as a unifying phenomenon at the tract level. This definition should be related to the regional historic context statement and the regional statement of significance for recreational residence tracts. The definition should be followed by a summary of how many individual lots/cabins meet that definition and whether there are enough contributors or other factors to qualify the tract as eligible for listing in the National Register.

Once a complete definition of the significant characteristics of the tract has been composed, each lot can be assigned a holistic rating based on an informed professional analysis of how the individual lot meets or fails to meet that definition. The holistic rating number can be used to produce the keyed maps that help a reviewer visualize the overall distribution of contributors and non-contributors.

In support of this significance statement, for each tract the following data should be provided:

- A list of buildings and their McNiel ratings.
- Documentation of the scoring system figures for tracts and for lots.
- Graphic representations showing the quantity of representative characteristics.
- The percentage of cabins rated at each integrity level.
- Where known, a description of modifications that occurred to the tract layout and placement of lots.

REFERENCES CITED

Ames, Davis L.

1998 Draft Guidelines for Evaluation and Documenting Suburban Historic Landscapes for the National Register of Historic Places. Center for Historic Architecture and Design, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware. 105 pp.

Birnbaum, Charles A.

1994 Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of historic Landscapes. Preservation Brief No. 36. U. S. Government Printing Office. 20 pp.

Graves, Henry S.

1915 Instructions Regarding Term Occupancy Permits. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 4pp.

McClelland, Linda Flint and J. Timothy Keller, Genevieve P. Keller, and Robert Z. Melnick

1999 Guidelines Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes. National Register Bulletin. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resource. 33pp.

McNiel, E. Steve

2000a Landscape Elements and Siting Relationships, Building characteristics, Materials, and Finishes. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5, Vallejo, CA. 89pp.

McNiel, E. Steve

2000b Building characteristics, Materials, and Finishes. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Region 5, Vallejo, CA. 75pp.

Starrs, Paul F.

1996 The Public as Agents of Policy. *In* Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project: Final report to Congress, vol. II, Assessments and scientific basis for management options. Davis: University of California, Centers for Water and Wildland Resources. Pp 125-144.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, California Region

1946 Administrative Guide for Special Uses. Unpublished manuscript on file with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA. 78pp.

Waugh, Frank A.
1918 Landscape Engineering in the National Forests. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office. 21pp.

Wyatt, Barbara, ed.
1987 Surveying and Evaluating Vernacular Architecture. Draft National Register Bulletin 31. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division, Washington, D.C. 53pp.

APPENDIX 1

CURRENT STATUS OF INVENTORY AND EVALUATIONS

CURRENT STATUS OF EVALUATIONS

01 - ANGELES

26 Tracts (617 cabin permits)

- 26 Tracts (617 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory

02 - CLEVELAND

16 Tracts (329 cabin permits)

- 14 Tracts (309 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 2 Tracts (20 cabin permits) have had just architectural inventory
- 0 Tracts have had no inventory work

03 - ELDORADO

37 Tracts (981 cabin permits)

- 28 Tracts (753 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory *(22 Tracts need additional minor data research, entry, and mapping)*
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 7 Tracts (183 cabin permits) have had just architectural inventory *(5 Tracts need additional minor data research, entry, and mapping)*
- 2 Tracts (45 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

04 - INYO

27 Tracts (406 cabin permits)

- 6 Tracts (103 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 1 Tract (27 cabin permits) have had archaeological, and a partial architectural inventory
- 2 Tracts (36 cabin permits) have had just architectural inventory
- 9 Tracts (106 cabin permits) have had just partial architectural inventory
- 9 Tracts (134 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

05 - KLAMATH

6 Tracts (22 cabin permits)

- 0 Tracts have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 6 Tracts (22 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

06 - LASSEN

9 Tracts (401 cabin permits)

- 3 Tracts (252 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 4 Tracts (101 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 2 Tracts (48 cabin permits) has had no inventory work

07 - LOS PADRES

7 Tracts (180 cabin permits)

- 5 Tracts (28 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 5 Tracts (86 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 6 Tracts (66 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

08 - MENDOCINO

8 Tracts (122 cabin permits)

- 5 Tracts (119 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 3 Tracts (3 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

09 - MODOC

3 Tracts (5 cabin permits)

- 0 Tracts have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 3 Tracts (5 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

11 - PLUMAS

3 Tracts (141 cabin permits)

- 1 Tract (13 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 2 Tracts (122 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 0 Tracts have had no inventory work

12 - SAN BERNARDINO

26 Tracts (780 cabin permits)

- 5.5 Tracts (515 cabin permits) have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 20.5 Tracts (787 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

13 - SEQUOIA

16 Tracts (250 cabin permits)

- 0 Tracts have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 16 Tracts (250 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

14 - SHASTA-TRINITY

6 Tracts (170 cabin permits)

- 0 Tracts have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 6 Tracts (170 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

15 - SIERRA

23 Tracts (559 cabin permits)

- 4 Tract (24 cabin permits) has had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 5 Tracts (413 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 14 Tracts (122 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

16 - STANISLAUS

26 Tracts (746 cabin permits)

- 1 Tract (383 cabin permits) has had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 15 Tracts (239 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 10 Tracts (124 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

17 - TAHOE

7 Tracts (193 cabin permits)

- 0 Tracts have had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 7 Tracts (193 cabin permits) have had no inventory work

19 - LTBMU

23 Tracts (597 cabin permits)

- 1 Tract (42 cabin permits) has had both architectural and archaeological inventory
- 22 Tracts (555 cabin permits) have had just archaeological inventory
- 0 Tracts have had just architectural inventory
- 0 Tracts have had no inventory work

APPENDIX 2

CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING EVALUATIONS

CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING EVALUATIONS

The following is the criteria that served as the basis for creating the priority by which work will be scheduled to complete the inventory of Recreation Residence Tracts. There are six items, all which have a numerical value associated with the relative value of the item as it applies to each tract.

CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Expiration Date of Current Permits

Year 2000/2001	0 Points
Year 2002/2003	1 Point
Year 2004/2005	2 Points
Year 2006/2007	3 Points
Year 2008	4 Points

Criterion 2: Work in Progress for Tract

Architectural and archaeological inventories completed	1 Point
Architectural or archaeological inventories completed	2 Points
Neither inventory completed	3 Points

Criterion 3: Percentage of Tract Inventory Work Completed to Date Forestwide

0-20%	4 Points
21-50%	3 Points
51-70%	2 Points
71-100%	1 Points

Criterion 4: Public Involvement/Profile

High	1 Point
Medium	2 Points
Low	3 Points

Criterion 5: Geographical location in relation to other Recreation Residence Tracts

Can be grouped for study	1 Point
Can not be grouped for study	2 Points

Criterion 6: Number of Permits per Tract

0-20	1 Point
21-50	2 Points
51-100	3 Points
100 +	4 Points

RATIONALE

These criteria are similar to those used in the CIP ranking process. The criteria have been applied to each recreation residence tract and a numerical point value assigned. The lower the numerical total, the higher the tract falls in terms of priority.

Criterion 1 recognizes that those tracts with early expiration dates for the permit will be done before those with later expiration dates. If a tract has a mix of expiration dates then the earliest date will serve as the point value for the whole tract.

Criterion 2 recognizes that inventory work of some tracts may have already been completed or partly completed, and the emphasis will be on those which are already partly completed.

Criterion 3 ranks those Forests that have already been doing the needed work. The combination of Criteria 2 and 3 will allow those Forests, which are near total completion of both their tracts' architectural and archaeological inventories to receive a higher priority than those Forests who have not begun their work. This basically states that one of the objectives is to complete as many Forest inventories as soon as possible to provide for consistent management of permit administration as it relates to historic values.

Criterion 4 recognizes that some forests are ``hot spots" when it comes to recreation residence permit administration, and those which are, will be ranked as a higher priority to complete than those which aren't.

Criterion 5 addresses the issue of economy of distance. In other words, a tract, which has a low priority, will score well in this criterion if it can be added to higher priority tracts and will add to a cost savings (i.e., two tracts located on the same highway may be contracted together rather than separately based on their respective rankings).

Criterion 6 is based on the economy of scale. Since the tract is the base unit of management of heritage values, it will be more efficient to complete 5 tracts of twenty cabin permits rather than 1 tract of 100 cabins.

APPENDIX 3

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

FOREST	REC. RESIDENCE TRACT	# Cabins	Est. Acres	Arch Surv	Hist Surv	Additional Information	Score	Notes
Eldorado	29 Mile	3	7.5	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	31 Mile	2	5	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	35 Mile	15	37.5	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	Aspen Circle	18	45	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	Bull Creek	14	35	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	Forni Creek	6	15	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	Phillips	6	15	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	Riverside	11	27.5	Y	Y#		9	
Eldorado	30 Mile	28	70	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	33 Mile	27	67.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	34 Mile	27	67.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	41 Mile	39	97.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	42 Mile	28	70	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	46 Mile	22	55	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	47 Mile	28	70	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Bryant Creek	31	77.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Caples Lake	13	32.5	N	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Dark Lake	7	17.5	N	Y		10	
Eldorado	Devil's Gate	14	35	N	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Fir	23	57.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Pyramid Creek	29	72.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Sayles Canyon	36	90	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Twin Bridges	7	17.5	Y	Y#		10	
Eldorado	Woods Lake	5	12.5	N	Y#		10	
Cleveland	Hulburd	17	42.5	N	Y		11	
Cleveland	Viejas	3	7.5	N	Y		11	
Eldorado	39 Mile	51	127.5	Y	Y#		11	
Eldorado	Gerle	41	102.5	N	Y		11	
Eldorado	Kirkwood	24	60	N	Y#		11	
Eldorado	Sciots	72	180	Y	Y#		11	
Lassen	Jonesville	16	40	Y	N		11	
Stanislaus	Peach Growers	20	50	N	N		11	
Eldorado	Bear River	45	112.5	N	N		12	
Eldorado	Cody	1	2.5	N	N		12	
Eldorado	Silver Lake	78	195	N	Y#		12	
Lassen	Butte Meadows	12	30	N	N		12	
Lassen	Feather River	35	87.5	Y	N		12	
Lassen	Willow	22	55	Y	N		12	
Lassen	Mill Creek Trailers	28	70	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Alpine Falls	9	22.5	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Bridge	20	50	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Channel	19	47.5	Y	N		12	

LTBMU	Fallen Leaf Park	1	2.5	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Fir Crags	16	40	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Fish Hatchery	3	7.5	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Island	2	5	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Lily Lake	10	25	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Lower Angora	12	30	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Mermaid Cove	18	45	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	North Shore	14	35	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Stanford	10	25	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Twin Crags	14	35	Y	N		12	
LTBMU	Upper Truckee	18	45	Y	N		12	
Sierra	Idylwilde	24	60	Y	N		12	
Sierra	Lakeview	6	15	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Buena Vista	2	5	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Cascade Creek	7	17.5	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Cedar Grove	4	10	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Douglas, West	9	22.5	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Niagara	3	7.5	Y	N		12	
Stanislaus	Wagner	16	40	Y	N		12	
Tahoe	Big Bend	11	27.5	N	N		12	
Inyo	Glass Creek	13	32.5	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Inyo	Lake George	10	25	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Inyo	Mill City	14	35	N	Y		13	
Inyo	Palisade	4	10	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Inyo	Seven Pines	18	45	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Inyo	Sherwin Creek	1	2.5	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Inyo	Whiskey Creek	5	12.5	N	Partial	Inventory done	13	Needs Da
Lassen	Eagle's Nest	42	105	N	N		13	
LTBMU	Echo Summit	44	110	Y	N		13	
LTBMU	Emerald Bay	22	55	Y	N		13	
LTBMU	Fallen Leaf Lake	43	107.5	Y	N		13	
LTBMU	Fallen Leaf Lodge	22	55	Y	N		13	
LTBMU	Hemlock	28	70	Y	N		13	
LTBMU	South Shore	41	102.5	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Angel Spring	9	22.5	N	N		13	
Sierra	Bear Creek	42	105	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Booth Station	1	2.5	N	N		13	
Sierra	Chambers	3	7.5	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Chepo	4	10	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Deer Creek	46	115	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Dinkey Bluff	13	32.5	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Home Creek	18	45	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Hosea Clark	3	7.5	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Isolated Cabin	2	5	N	N		13	
Sierra	Isolated (Collins)	1	2.5	N	N		13	
Sierra	Langworthy	1	2.5	Y	N		13	
Sierra	Rancheria	24	60	N	N		13	
Sierra	Snowslide	5	12.5	N	N		13	

Sierra	Wishon	6	15	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Bone Springs	10	25	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Bumble Bee	21	52.5	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Cow Creek	42	105	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Deadman	18	45	N	N		13	
Stanislaus	Douglas, East	22	55	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Leland Meadow	23	57.5	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Mill Creek	7	17.5	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Riverside	6	15	Y	N		13	
Stanislaus	Twin Buttes	7	17.5	N	N		13	
Tahoe	Carvin Creek	20	50	N	N		13	
Tahoe	Casa Loma	11	27.5	N	N		13	
Tahoe	Ramshorn	7	17.5	N	N		13	
Tahoe	Wild Plum	1	2.5	N	N		13	
Inyo	Big Pines Creek	11	27.5	N	N		14	
Inyo	Crater	3	7.5	N	Partial	Inventory done	14	Needs Da
Inyo	Falls	22	55	N	Y		14	
Inyo	Gem Lake	1	2.5	N	N		14	
Inyo	Lake Mary	30	75	N	Partial	Inventory done	14	Needs Da
Inyo	Lake Sabrina	8	20	N	N		14	
Inyo	Rock Creek Lake	12	30	N	N		14	
Inyo	South Fork Bishop Creek	10	25	N	N		14	
Inyo	Twin Lakes	22	55	N	Partial	Inventory done	14	Needs Da
Inyo	Utter	4	10	N	N		14	
Inyo	Whitney Portal	27	67.5	Y	Partial	Inventory done	14	Needs Da
Los Padres	Chuchupate	7	17.5	N	N		14	
Los Padres	Figueroa	10	25	N	N		14	
Los Padres	Fremont	9	22.5	N	N		14	
Los Padres	Oso	9	22.5	N	N		14	
Los Padres	San Marcos	1	2.5	N	N		14	
LTBMU	Rainbow	51	127.5	Y	N		14	
Mendocino	Myers Cabin	1	2.5	N	N		14	
Mendocino	Red Rock Cabin	1	2.5	N	N		14	
Mendocino	Twin Springs	1	2.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Alder Creek	2	5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Big Pines	7	17.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Falls	15	37.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Fish Creek	4	10	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Fuller Mill Creek	2	5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Lake View	95	237.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Lost Creek	5	12.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Mountain Home	1	2.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Middle Lytle Creek	10	25	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Pine Knot	8	20	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Round Cienaga	9	22.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Snow Creek	1	2.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Snow Valley	7	17.5	N	N		14	
San Berdo	Willow Spring	6	15	N	N		14	

Sierra	Dinkey Creek	27	67.5	Y	N	14
Sierra	Dowville	94	235	Y	N	14
Sierra	Lower Line	66	165	Y	N	14
Sierra	Upper Line Creek	31	77.5	N	N	14
Stanislaus	Baker	1	2.5	Y	N	14
Stanislaus	Brightman Flat	58	145	Y	N	14
Stanislaus	Hermit Valley	5	12.5	N	N	14
Stanislaus	Mosquito Lakes/Pacific Heights	6	15	N	N	14
Stanislaus	Pacific Creek	1	2.5	N	N	14
Stanislaus	Pacific Valley	6	15	N	N	14
Stanislaus	Tryon Meadow	7	17.5	N	N	14
Tahoe	Clark Station	31	77.5	N	N	14
Tahoe	Haskell Creek	34	85	N	N	14
Inyo	Pine Glade	30	75	N	N	15
Inyo	Pine Glade Extension	30	75	N	N	15
Inyo	Silver Lake	28	70	N	N	15
Los Padres	Santa Lucia	26	65	N	N	15
LTBMU	Spring Creek	139	347.5	Y	N	15
San Berdo	Camp Angelus	30	75	N	N	15
San Berdo	Lytle Creek	34	85	N	N	15
San Berdo	Mill Creek	24	60	N	?	15
San Berdo	Seven Oaks	41	102.5	N	N	15
San Berdo	South Fork	50	125	N	N	15
San Berdo	Stetson Creek	22	55	N	N	15
Stanislaus	Big Meadow	24	60	N	N	15
Stanislaus	Lake Alpine	37	92.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Corral Creek	1	2.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Deer Creek	14	35	N	N	15
Sequoia	El Monte	3	7.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Heart Meadow	10	25	N	N	15
Sequoia	Kern Park	7	17.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Poso	1	2.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Shirley Meadow	20	50	N	N	15
Sequoia	Slick Rock	19	47.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Soda Springs	20	50	N	N	15
Sequoia	Spear Creek	9	22.5	N	N	15
Sequoia	Summit	8	20	N	N	15
Sequoia	Weeping Springs	2	5	N	N	15
Tahoe	Jackson Creek	4	10	N	N	15
Tahoe	Loganville	1	2.5	N	N	15
Tahoe	Prairie Creek	13	32.5	N	N	15
Tahoe	Sierra	2	5	N	N	15
Klamath	Eagle	5	12.5	N	N	16
Klamath	Kelsey Creek	5	12.5	N	N	16
Klamath	Middle Creek	1	2.5	N	N	16
Klamath	North Fork	8	20	N	N	
Klamath	North Forks/Cummings	3	7.5	N	N	

Klamath	Sand Flat	1	2.5	N	N
Los Padres	Santa Ynez	152	380	N	N
Modoc	Blue Lake #1	1	2.5	N	N
Modoc	Blue Lake #2	1	2.5	N	N
Modoc	Little Medicine Lake	3	7.5	N	N
San Berdo	Barton Flats	95	237.5	N	N
Sequoia	Coy Flat	41	102.5	N	N
Sequoia	Hume Lake	47	117.5	N	N
Sequoia	McIntyre	26	65	N	N
Sequoia	White River	22	55	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Didallis #1	2	5	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Didallis #2	6	15	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Forest Glen	11	27.5	N	N
Tahoe	Silver Creek	23	57.5	N	N
San Berdo	Big Bear	244	610	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Campbell Creek	29	72.5	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Salt Creek	48	120	N	N
Shasta-Trinity	Silver Thorn	74	185	N	N

= Minor Editing (research to fill in blanks such as missing dates of constructio n, holistic values/ratin gs, and maps, etc.)

Eldorado Missing Data

(UCD refers to University of California, Davis)

Highway 50

Bull Creek: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Year constructed, holistic value, and rating for "cabin is % intact" needed.

29 Milestone: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Year constructed, holistic value, and rating for "cabin is % intact" needed.

30 Milestone: Needs "new" map, otherwise complete.

31 Milestone: Need year constructed.

33 Milestone: Need year constructed given in UCD sheets (except for one or two).

Riverside: Need year constructed given in UCD sheets.

34 Milestone: Need year constructed given in UCD sheets.

35 Milestone: Need data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value and rating for % intact..

36 Milestone: There are no UCD data sheets or "new" maps for this tract but there is a rating tally sheet (completed by Supernowicz). R-5 Summer Homes, Resorts Recordation Forms, Eldorado NF, have been prepared.

39 Milestone: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed given for all lots. Lots 1-32, several holistic values or rating for "cabin is % intact" missing. Lots 33-52, Need year constructed, holistic values, and % intact ratings given. "New" maps need editing.

Forni Creek: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, and rating for "cabin is % intact".

41 Milestone: Need UCD data descriptive sheets and "new" maps for this tract.

Sciots/Cody: Need UCD data sheets but R-5 Summer Homes, Resorts Recordation Forms, ENF completed (1993 by Beverly Monti).

42 Milestone: UCD data sheets need year constructed. Lot 20 has missing information (no year constructed, holistic rating, % intact and description is incomplete). Other forms for the tract completed [R-5 Summer Homes, Resorts Recordation Forms, ENF (1993 by Sandra Tedrou)].
Lots 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 40 need year constructed, holistic values, and % intact ratings given, and some cabin descriptions are incomplete.

Twin Bridges: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, and rating for "cabin is % intact".

Sayles Canyon: Missing "new" map. UCD data sheets are incomplete. Need year constructed given for all structures Lots 16, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 34, are missing % intact rating. Otherwise, data appears to be complete although the architectural integrity analysis sheets are a different version (older format?).

Fir: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, and rating for % intact.

Bryant Creek: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed given for all cabin/lots. Lots 2 and 6 are missing the % intact rating. Lots 16-36 are missing the holistic value and rating for % intact. R-5 Summer Homes, Resorts Recordation Forms, ENF (1993 by Teresa Dunlap) are completed. "New" maps are poorly constructed and need editing.

46 Milestone: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed given for all cabin/lots. Lots 22, 25, 26, 32, and 122.5 need the % intact rating.

47 Milestone: "New" maps need editing. Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, and rating for % intact.

Aspen Creek: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, andrating for % intact.

Phillips: Missing data in the UCD sheets. Need year constructed, holistic value, and rating for % intact.

Highway 88

Caples Lake: UCD data sheets need year constructed and for lot 2 the % intact. There are no maps.

Woods Lake: UCD data sheets need year constructed. There are no maps.

Lake Kirkwood: Older version of the architectural integrity analysis forms are complete (and include year constructed). There are no maps.

Devil's Gate: UCD data sheets need year constructed.

Silver Lake (includes West and East): Complete per McNiel and Supernowicz (1995). Analysis needs editing--modern structures were included.

APPENDIX 4

FOREST SERVICE/DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION FORMS FOR RECREATION RESIDENCE TRACTS